GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

CALL NO. 059.0954 J.E.I.A.

D.G.A. 79.

JOURNAL

OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,

LONDON.

FOUNDED 1866.

VOL. V.

LONDON:
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,
20, GREAT GEORGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

1871.

The following NEWSPAPERS and MAGAZINES are received and filed at the Reading Room of the East India Association, 20, Great George Street, Westminster.

(*Free to Members.*)

INDIAN NEWSPAPERS.

The Delhi Gazette	Published at	Agra.
The Aligurh Gazette	,,	,, Aligurh.
The Mofussilite	,,	,, Allahabad.
The Argus	,,	,, Bombay.
The Hindu Reformer	,,	,, ,,
The Hindu Prakash	,,	,, ,,
The Native Opinion	,,	,, ,,
The Times of India	,,	,, ,,
The Bengalee	,,	,, Calcutta.
The Friend of India	,,	,, ,,
The Hindoo Patriot	,,	,, ,,
The Indian Daily News	,,	,, ,,
The Indian Economist, with its Supplements, the 'Statistical Reporter,' and 'Agricultural Gazette of India'	,,	,, ,,
The Indian Mirror	,,	,, ,,
The Jabulpur Chronicle	,,	,, Jabulpur.
The Madras Athenæum and Daily News	,,	,, Madras.
The Madras Times	,,	,, ,,
The Indian Public Opinion	,,	,, Lahore.
The Koh-i-noor	,,	,, ,,

NEWSPAPERS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Daily.

The Times. *The Standard.* *The Daily News.*

Bi-weekly.

The Asiatic, with Summary of News from India	Published every	Tuesday.
The Asiatic, with Summary of News for India	,, ,,	Friday.

Weekly.

Allen's Indian Mail	,, ,,	Tuesday.
The London and China Telegraph	,, ,,	Monday.
The Homeward Mail	,, ,,	Saturday.
The Illustrated London News	,, ,,	,,
The Journal of the Society of Arts and Official Record of the International Exhibitions	,, ,,	Friday.
Punch	,, ,,	Wednesday.

Monthly.

Journal of the National Indian Association in Aid of the Social Progress in India	,,	at Bristol.
The Cotton Supply Reporter	,,	,, Manchester.
The Financial Reformer	,,	,, Liverpool.

Periodically.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (On Indian Topics, specially extracted and printed for the East India Association).

Journal of the Statistical Society.

Library Reg. No. 206 of 07

COLLECTIVE INDEX

OF

CONTENTS OF VOLS. I.–V. (1867–71)

OF THE

JOURNAL OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,

WITH PRICES FOR EXTRA COPIES OF QUARTERLY PARTS.

FOR SALE.

In LONDON, at the EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION ROOMS, 20, Great George Street, Westminster.
In BOMBAY, at the Office of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, Apollo Street.
In CALCUTTA, at the Office of the Association's Agent, Mr. COWASJEE PESTONJEE, 19, Ezra Street.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—YEAR 1867.

(*Note.*—The Second Edition consists of the whole of this Volume in one Cover, price, in England, 3s.; in India, 2 Rupees.)

FIRST EDITION—PART I.

Price to Members, 1s. 6d.; to Non-Members, 2s. 6d.

NO.				First Edition. PAGE	Second Edition. PAGE
1.			Introduction	1	
2.			List of Members	5	
3.			Rules	8	
4.	1867. March	14.	First Annual Meeting	11	1
5.	1867. May	2.	LORD LYVEDEN—A[illegible] the Presidentship of the [illegible]	23	7
6.	1867. May	2.	DADABHAI NAOROJI — England's Duties to India	26	9
7.	1867. May	2.	Deputation to SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE (to explain the effect of the General Order published by the Calcutta Government upon Lord Cranbourne's Bonus Compensation Despatch of the 8th of August, 1866)	52	25
8.	1867. June	11.	SIR A. COTTON—Irrigation and Water Transit in India	55	27
9.	1867. June	25.	Adjourned Annual Meeting	87	44

059.0954 b
J. E. I. A.
27015

FIRST EDITION—PART II.

Price to Members, 1s. 6d.; *to Non-Members*, 2s. 6d.

NO.				First Edition. PAGE	Second Edition. PAGE
10.—Introduction				115	
11.—List of Members				117	
12.—Rules				121	
13.—1867. July	5.	DADABHAI NAOROJI—Mysore		125	58
14.—1867. July	7.	W. C. BONNERJEE—Representative and Responsible Government for India		157	77
15.—1867. Aug.	6.	COL. G. HALY—The Fisheries of India		200	98
16.—1867. Aug.	13.	Discussion regarding Memorial to the Secretary of State for India "On the Admission of the Natives of India into the Indian Civil Service"		212	104
17.—1867. Aug.	21.	Deputation to SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE on the above subject		255	105

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—YEAR 1868.

PART I.

Price to Members, 1s. 6d.; *to Non-Members*, 2s. 6d.

18.—List of Members			5
19.—Rules			13
20.—1867. Nov.	13.	W. C. BONNERJEE—Reform of the Hindu Marriage Laws	17
21.—1867. Nov.	29.	DADABHAI NAOROJI—The Expenses of the Abyssinian War	46
22.—1867. Dec.	5.	Presentation of an Address to SIR BARTLE FRERE, G.C.S.I., K.C.B.	64
23.—1867. Dec.	6.	SIR A. COTTON—The Opening of the Godavery River	74
24.—1867. Dec.	17.	P. M. MEHTA—The Educational System in the Presidency of Bombay	103
25.—1868. Jan.	10.	COL. G. HALY—The Capabilities of the Hill Ranges of India, and Coffee and Tea Planting on them	128
26.—1868. Jan.	21.	CAPT. R. A. CHADWICK—The Furlough Regulations of the Indian Army	140
27.—1868. Jan.	31.	H. [illegible] M.P.—The Representation of India in the Imperial Parliament	151

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY,
CALL NO.
Acc. No. 27015
Date 20-6-57.
059.0954/T.P.I.

PART II.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

NO.			PAGE
28.—1868.	Feb.	4. MAJOR EVANS BELL—Claims of the Natives of India to a Share in the Executive Government of their Country	183
29.—1868.	Feb.	11. P. M. TAIT—On the Population and Mortality of Calcutta	200
30.—1868.	Feb.	21. THOS. BRIGGS—Proposal of an Indian Policy under the New Reform Parliament	219

PART III.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

31.—1868.	March	3. ROBT. KNIGHT — India: a Review of England's Financial Relations therewith	227

PART IV.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

32.—1868.	May	6. SIR A. COTTON—On the Opening of the Godavery River (Adjourned Discussion)	285
33.—1868.	June	6. MISS CARPENTER—Education and Reformatory Treatment	294
34.—1868.	June	24. LORD W. M. HAY—Note on MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI'S Paper of the 5th July, 1867, on the Mysore Succession	305
35.—1868.	July	8. DADABHAI NAOROJI'S Reply thereto	312
36.—1868.	July	18. Annual Meeting	321
37.—1868.	Oct.	29. DADABHAI NAOROJI—On the Duties of Local Indian Associations	327

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.—YEAR 1869.

PART I.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

38.—1868.	Nov.	4. Deputation to the EARL OF MAYO to present a Memorial on the Importance of Irrigation in India	1
39.—1868.	Dec.	8. Discussion on Indian Irrigation Works	2
40.—1868.	Dec.	18. Deputation to the DUKE OF ARGYLL on the above Subjects	8
41.—1869.	Jan.	1. F. LOGIN, C.E.—The Material Improvement of India	15

PART II.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

NO.			PAGE
42.—1869. Feb.	2.	W. Bowden, Ju[illegible] Condition and Prospects of the [illegible] (Madras Presidency, East India), with especial reference to Irrigation and Navigation Works	25
43.—1869. Feb.	18.	Lord Stanley of Alderley—The Establishment of a "Mussafir-Khanch" or "Guest-house" for Asiatics in London	41
44.—1869. April	7.	Sir Vincent Eyre—A Retrospect of the Affghan War, with reference to Passing Events in Central Asia	48
45.—1869. April	7.	Appendix and Coloured Map to Sir V. Eyre's Paper on the Affghan War	62

PART III.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

46.—List of Officers and Members			i–xvi
47.—1869. May	5.	Dadabhai Naoroji—Lecture at Bombay on the Work of the East India Association	65
48.—1869. May	22.	Report of a Meeting held at Bombay for the Consideration of the Desirability of Forming a Bombay Branch of the East India Association	71
49.—1869. May	22.	Rules of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association	76
50.—1869. June	23.	Annual Meeting	82
51.—1869. June	23.	Annual Report of the Council of the East India Association, 1868–9	86
52.—1869. July	7.	Dadabhai Naoroji—Indian Civil Service Clause in the Governor-General of India Bill	88
53.—1869. July	21.	Ditto (Adjourned Discussion)	97
54.—1869. Oct.	12.	P. M. Tait—On the Population and Mortality of Bombay	102
55.—List of Donations		.. ..	124

PART IV.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

56.—1868. April	4.	Dadabhai Naoroji—On the Admission of Educated Natives into the Indian Civil Service	125
57.—1869. Oct.	29.	Hyde Clarke—On Transport in India in reference to the Interest of England and India	157

NO.				PAGE
58.—1869.	Nov.	17.	GEORGE SIMMONS, C.E.—The Advantages of Encouraging the English Language to become the Colloquial Tongue of India, with a Practical System for its Development	172
59.—1869.	Nov.	26.	R. H. ELLIOT—On the Beneficial Effects of Caste Institutions	177
60.—1869.	Dec.	12.	DADABHAI NAOROJI—The Bombay Cotton Act of 1869	189

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.—YEAR 1870.

PART I.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

61.—1869.	Dec.	14.	SIR A. COTTON—On the Proposed Additional Expenditure of 100 Millions on Railways in India	1
62.—1870.	Jan.	11.	DR. A. GRAHAM—On the Industrial Settlement of Europeans in the Hilly Climates of India	17
63.—1870.	Jan.	28.	I. T. PRICHARD—On the Relations between the Native States and the British Government	35
64.—For 1870.			Rules and Regulations for Indian Services, in reference to Competitive Examinations, Appointments, Agreements with Government, Furlough, &c., &c.	49
65.—List of Donations to the Permanent Fund				82

PART II.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

66.—1869.	Dec.	22.	P. M. MEHTA—(Paper read before the Bombay Branch) On the Grant-in-Aid System in the Presidency of Bombay	89
67.—1870.	Feb.	25.	LIEUT.-COL. J. C. PHILLIPS—The Bonus System in the Indian Army	98
68.—1870.	March	8.	W. TAYLER—The Delay of Justice to Indian Appellants in England: its Causes, Consequences, and possible Remedy	106

NO. PAGE

69.—1870. March 25. SIR A. COTTON—On the Proposed Additional Expenditure of 100 Millions on Railways in India (First Adjourned Discussion) 116

70.—1870. May 25. Annual Meeting 136

71.—1870. May 25. Annual Report of the Council of the East India Association, 1869–70 140

27.—Rules 148

PART III.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

73.—1870. April 29. SIR A. COTTON—On the Proposed Additional Expenditure of 100 Millions on Railways in India (Second Adjourned Discussion).. 151

74.—1870. May 6. I. T. PRICHARD—On the Relations between the Native States and the British Government (Adjourned Discussion) 164

75.—1870. May 13. MISS CARPENTER — On the Work done by her for Female Education in India 175

76.—1870. June 30. W. S. FITZWILLIAM— On the Present and Future Product of Cotton in India compared with that of America and other Cotton-producing Countries .. 183

77.—1870. July 13. MAJOR EVANS BELL—Is India a Conquered Country? and if so, What then?.. 201

PART IV.

Price to Members, 1s.; *to Non-Members*, 2s.

78.—1870. June 15. I. T. PRICHARD—On Indian Finance 219

79.—1870. June 22. SIR BARTLE FRERE—On Public Works in India 239

80.—1870. July 6. Ditto (Adjourned Discussion).. 256

81.—1870. July 27. DADABHAI NAOROJI—The Wants and Means of India.. 278

82.—1870. July 27. SIR CHAS. TREVELYAN—On the Finances of India .. 290

83.—1870. July 27. Resolution to Memorialize Parliament for Select Committees to inquire into the whole Administration of India 324

84.—Rules 325

85.—Petition to the House of Commons (in accordance with the above Resolution) which was to be presented on Friday, 17th February, 1871, by Sir CHARLES J. WINGFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B., M.P. 327

Title Pages and Lists of Contents for Vols. I.-IV.

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.—YEAR 1871.

PART I.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

NO				PAGE
86.—1870.	June	8.	DR. TH. GOLDSTÜCKER—On the Deficiencies in the Present Administration of Hindu Law	1
87.—1870.	April	27.	PHEROZSHAH M. MEHTA—On the East India (Laws and Regulations) Bill, Clause 6	56
88.—1870.	April	27.	Appendix. That Act in extenso	67

89.—Collective Index of Journal.

90.—List of Officers.

PART II.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

91.—1871. Feb. 15. DADABHAI NAOROJI—On the Commerce of India ..

92.—1871. March 3. Ditto (Adjourned Discussion) .. ..

93.—1871. March 7. SIR CHAS. TREVELYAN—On the Finances of India (Discussion Adjourned from the 27th July, 1870) ..

94.—1871. Feb. 17. Petition of the Council of the East India Association to the House of Commons, praying for Select Committee to inquire into the Financial and General Administration of India; with Signatures of Council

95.—1871. May . Ditto ditto of the Bombay Branch of the East India Asso[illegible] also for Local Commissions to take [illegible] the spot .. ..

PART III.

Price to Members, 1s.; to Non-Members, 2s.

96.—1871. April 25. W. TAYLER—Popular Education in India .. .. ..

97.—1871. March 28. SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE—Ship Canal between India and Ceylon .. ..

98.—1871. May 3. Deputation to HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL, K.T., Secretary of State for India, on that subject .. ..

99.—1871. Annual Report .. ..

100.—1871. Abstract of Accounts .. ..

The following NEWSPAPERS and MAGAZINES are received and filed at the Reading Room of the East India Association, 20, Great George Street, Westminster.

(Free to Members.)

INDIAN NEWSPAPERS.

The Delhi Gazette	Published at	Agra.
The Aligurh Gazette	„	„	Aligurh.
The Mofussilite	„	„	Allahabad.
The Hindu Reformer	„	„	Bombay.
The Indu Prakash	„	„	„
The Native Opinion	„	„	„
The Times of India	„	„	„
The Bengalee	„	„	Calcutta.
The Friend of India	„	„	„
The Hindoo Patriot	„	„	„
The Indian Daily News	„	„	„
The Indian Economist, with its Supplements, the 'Statistical Reporter,' and 'Agricultural Gazette of India'	„	„	„
The Indian Mirror	„	„	„
The Jabulpur Chronicle	„	„	Jabulpur.
The Madras Athenæum and Daily News	„	„	Madras.
The Madras Times	„	„	„
The Indian Public Opinion	„	„	Lahore.
The Koh-i-noor	„	„	„

NEWSPAPERS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Daily.

The Times. *The Standard.* *The Daily News.*

Bi-weekly.

The Asiatic, with Summary of News from India	Published every		Tuesday.
The Asiatic, with Summary of News for India	„	„	Friday.

Weekly.

Allen's Indian Mail	„	„	Tuesday.
The London and China Telegraph	„	„	Monday.
The Homeward Mail	„	„	Saturday.
The Illustrated London News	„	„	„
The Journal of the Society of Arts and Official Record of the International Exhibitions	„	„	Friday.
Punch	„	„	Wednesday.

Monthly.

Journal of the Statistical Society.			
Journal of the National Indian Association in Aid of the Social Progress in India	„		at Bristol.
The European Mail.			
The Cotton Supply Reporter	„	„	Manchester.
The Financial Reformer	„	„	Liverpool.

Periodically.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (On Indian Topics, specially extracted and printed for the East India Association).

[illegible] Printing Co.

JOURNAL
OF THE
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

MEETING, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1870.

WILLIAM TAYLER, Esq., in the Chair.

The following Paper was read by Dr. Th. Goldstücker, Professor of Sanskrit in University College, London, &c. :—

On the Deficiencies in the Present Administration of Hindu Law.

The attention of the East India Association having lately been drawn by Mr. W. Tayler to some urgent wants in the administration of justice, in so far as Indian litigants in general are concerned, it may not be inexpedient to bring under your notice the difficulties which beset the course of justice in reference to a particular class of cases which it did not enter into the scope of Mr. Tayler's able paper to deal with, viz. of those cases which are governed by Hindu law.

This law, I need not explain, concerns two topics of litigation only—that of inheritance and that of adoption—topics intimately connected with Hindu religious belief, and therefore allowed to remain free from the touch of foreign legislation.

The Hindu law, it is likewise unnecessary for me to add, is laid down in the ancient and mediæval works of the Hindus, all of which are written in Sanskrit. It is contained in the code of Manu, in that of Yâjñavalkya, in the codes of numerous legislators, which are intermediate between, or posterior to, both these great authorities, and in a number of subsequent, but very important commentaries and digests, which have developed the ancient law, and ultimately, because latest in time, have become first in authority.* Amongst these, one of the most important in all matters relating to the law of inheritance is the *Mitákshará* of *Vijñáneśvara*, which, as Colebrooke says, is, with the exception of Bengal, "received in all the schools of Hindu law, from Benares to the southern

* See 'Yâjñavalkya-Dharmaśâstra,' I., 4, 5; H. T. Colebrooke's Preface to 'Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance;' A. F. Stenzler, "Zur Literatur der Indischen Gesetzbücher," in A. Weber's 'Indische Studien,' vol. i., pp. 232 ff.; Standish Grove Grady, 'A Treatise on the Hindoo Law of Inheritance,' pp. lix.–lxxiv.

extremity of the peninsula of India, as the chief groundwork of the doctrines which they follow, and as an authority from which they rarely dissent."* The Mitâksharâ was expanded in subsequent digests, and, in consequence, the Vivâdachintâmaṅi, the Ratnâkara, and Vivâdachandra, became the first legal authorities, on matters of inheritance, in Mithilâ (Tirhut); the Vîramitrodaya and the works of Kamalâkara became so at Benares; the Vyavahâramayûkha amongst the Mahrattas, and the Smṛitichandrikâ and Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya at Madras.

In Bengal the paramount authority on the law of inheritance is Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga, which in several important respects differs from the ruling of the Mitâksharâ; and in agreement with it are Raghunandana's Dâyatattva, Śrîkṛishṇa-Tarkâlaṁkâra's Dâyakramasaṁgraha, besides various other works, which it is not necessary here to enumerate.†

The best authorities on the law of adoption are the Dattakamîmâṁsâ, by Nanda Paṅḍita; the Dattakachandrikâ, by Devaṅḍa Bhaṭṭa; and after them, the Dattakanirṇaya, Dattakatilaka, Dattakadarpaṇa, Dattakakaumudî, Dattakadîdhiti, and Dattakasiddhântamañjarî. All these commentaries and digests derive their authority from, and profess to be based on, the codes of Manu and Yâjñavalkya and the other lawgivers already alluded to. They do not admit that there is any real difference between the laws laid down in the ancient works; and wherever any such differences seem to exist, they either endeavour to reconcile them by the interpretations they put on their texts, or explain them away by the assumption of accidental omissions which they supply. And it is in consequence of such interpretations or additions that different conclusions have obtained in the Mitâksharâ- and the Bengal-schools, though both profess to derive their opinions from a correct and authoritative understanding of the same ancient texts.

That all these commentaries and digests, whenever it suits their line of argument, occasionally also refer to other non-legal works of Sanskrit literature, such as the vedic Gṛihyasûtras, the Mahâbhârata, Râmâyaṇa, the Purâṇas, and even the grammar of Pâṇini, need not surprise us, for their object is to convey the impression that a harmonious spirit pervades the whole antiquity of India, and that their ruling, therefore, is in accordance with all that is sacred to the Hindu mind.

Now, from the facts I have been able to gather, it would appear that, with scarcely any exception, the English judges who are entrusted with the administration of the Hindu law of inheritance and adoption, are not

* 'Two Treatises,' Pref., p. iv.

† Compare the works mentioned in the note of the preceding page.

acquainted with the Sanskrit language, and are unable therefore to found their decisions on a direct and immediate knowledge and examination of the original law sources just mentioned. They must resort, therefore, to second-hand information which they derive from translations, and the assistance afforded them by the pleadings of counsel and otherwise. But as I am probably not very wrong in assuming that for the most part the counsel, too, are indebted for their knowledge of the Hindu law, not to the original texts, but to translations of them, these translations are the real basis on which the administration of the Hindu law at present rests, and it will, therefore, be necessary to give a brief account of them.

Of the code of Manu there exists the well-known complete translation of Sir W. Jones, first published in 1794, then in 1796, and reprinted by Haughton in 1825. It was translated into German by Hüttner in 1797. A French translation of the original by Loiseleur Deslongchamps, mainly agreeing with that of his celebrated predecessor, appeared in 1833.* A complete translation in German of the code of Yâjñavalkya was published by Professor Stenzler in 1849; and some portions of the same code translated into English by Dr. Roer and Mr. Montriou appeared in 1859.

The Mitâksharâ of Vijñâneśvara is a running commentary on each verse of Yâjñavalkya's Institutes. The latter consist of three parts. The first treats of *âchâra*, or established rules of conduct, comprising such

* About thirty years ago, I believe, there appeared at Calcutta a few parts of a new edition and translation of Manu, which seem to have remained almost unknown in Europe. The quarto volume in question, when opened, contains on the left side in one column the text of Manu in Devanâgarî, and in Bengali characters; and in another, a Bengali translation of the corresponding verses, a few foot-notes in Bengali being generally added to the page; on the right side it contains in one column Sir W. Jones's translation, and parallel to it, in another column, a new English translation, which may be looked upon as a running criticism on the former. For though it repeats as much as it approves of Sir W. Jones's translation, in the very words of the latter, this is apparently done in order to make its divergence from it still more prominent; and this divergence is not inconsiderable, and very often marks a decided improvement on the rendering of Sir W. Jones. Foot-notes in English, moreover, are frequently added to justify the discrepancies. Unfortunately—for there is no doubt that the author of the new translation was a very competent scholar—in the two copies of it known to me, the text breaks off at verse 40, and the translation at verse 33, of Book 3, while these two copies do not contain the name of the author or a date; and since all my endeavours to learn more about the progress of the work have been unsuccessful, I apprehend that no more of it, than the portions I have seen, has appeared in print. The name of the editor and translator, as I learn from a friend, is Tarachund Chuckerbutt.

subjects as education and marriage, funeral rites, &c. The second part treats of *vyavahâra*, or the business of life, including amongst many other topics judicature and inheritance; the third part treats of *prâyaśchitta*, and comprises penance, purification, transmigration, and kindred subjects. Of the Vyavahâra part of the Mitâksharâ eight chapters translated by W. H. Macnaghten first appeared in 1829; and that portion of it which strictly relates to inheritance, about the fourteenth part of the whole work, exists in the well-known translation by Colebrooke, first published in 1810, and then edited in his Hindu law books by Mr. Whitley Stokes in 1865. Of the Vyavahâramayûkha, Harry Borradaile published a translation in 1827, which likewise reappeared in Mr. Stokes's Hindu law books in 1865.

The Vivâdachintâmaṅi, translated into English by Prossonno Coomar Tagore, was published in 1863; the Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya, by Mr. A. C. Burnell, in 1868, and—through the medium of Tamul sources, as I am informed—the Smṛitichandrikâ, by Mr. T. Kristnasawmy Iyer, in 1867. Of Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga we possess the translation of Colebrooke, first published in 1810, and in his law books by Mr. Stokes in 1865; and of the Dâyakramasaṁgraha—also edited in the same collection by the same distinguished scholar—the translation of Wynch, first published in 1818.

Lastly, the Dattakamîmâṁsâ and Dattakachandrikâ exist in a translation by Sutherland, first published in 1821, then in 1825, and also embodied in Mr. Stokes's Hindu law books.

Besides these few translations, nothing whatever worth mentioning, out of the large bulk of Hindu law literature, is accessible to the English judge, if unacquainted with Sanskrit, except a few disconnected verses of the ancient lawgivers, put together, without any reference to the context in which they stand, in the Digest of Hindu law prepared by Jagannâtha under the directions of Sir W. Jones.*

The question, then, which I have to raise is this: Do these translations—a mere fraction, I need not say, of the large mass of Hindu

* Colebrooke's opinion of this Digest is contained in the following passage from his preface to the 'Two Treatises,' &c., p. ii.:—"In the preface to the translation of the Digest, I hinted an opinion unfavorable to the arrangement of it, as it has been executed by the native compiler. I have been confirmed in that opinion of the compilation, since its publication; and indeed the author's method of discussing together the discordant opinions maintained by the lawyers of the several schools, without distinguishing in an intelligible manner which of them is the received doctrine of each school, but on the contrary leaving it uncertain whether any of the opinions stated by him do actually prevail, or which doctrine must now be considered to be in force and which obsolete,

law literature — suffice both in quality and quantity for ensuring to litigants a proper and satisfactory administration of the Hindu law of inheritance and adoption?

Before giving my opinion on this point, I will place myself in the position of a judge who has no means of examining for himself the original text of a statute, and I should then have to assume that the question asked must be answered by him in the affirmative. For on what grounds could he decide that the translations enumerated above were insufficient in quantity, and how could he undertake to say that any objection mooted against their reliability was valid or not? It would be a dangerous and, I hold, an arbitrary proceeding on his part were he to overrule, for instance, the translation of a passage by Tagore or Burnell, merely because the translation of the same passage by Colebrooke did not agree with it, and because the authority of Colebrooke stands higher than that of the scholars differing from him. For however high the authority of anyone, a doubt of this kind cannot be finally settled by it; and a mere consideration of the immense progress made by Sanskrit studies since the time when the great Colebrooke wrote, of the large quantity of new materials that have since come to light, of all the advantages in short, which, in consequence of the very labours of Colebrooke, later workers in the same field must have over him, would naturally make a judge hesitate in disposing of such doubts simply on the ground of tradition and authority.

Yet instances of such conflicting translations are by no means rare; and where therefore for his final opinion the judge would have to rely on third parties, his position would at any rate not be safe.

To illustrate this uncertainty I will choose at random a few examples as they occur to me.

The Mitâkshará and the digests, as I have already observed, constantly support their statements by quotations from Manu, Yâjñavalkya, and the other lawgivers; but as every disputed case has not been foreseen by them, these very quotations sometimes become the principal basis on which the judgment in a particular case has to rest.

In dealing with the rights of brothers, a verse of Yâjñavalkya is quoted by the Dâyabhâga of Jîmûtavâhana, which Colebrooke translates as follows:—

"A half-brother, being again associated, may take the succession; not

---

renders his work of little utility to persons conversant with the law, and of still less service to those who are not versed in *Indian* jurisprudence; especially to the *English* reader, for whose use, through the medium of translation, the work was particularly intended."

a *half-brother*,* though not re-united: but one united [by blood, *though not by coparcenery*] may obtain the property; and not [*exclusively*] the son of a different mother."†

In the Vivâdachintâmaṅi, Tagore translates this verse thus:—

"Re-united step-brothers, but not *brothers* who live separated, shall take each other's property. A uterine brother *even when he is separated*, shall have the property. But a *separated* step-brother cannot get it."‡

Again, in the Vyavahâramayûkha we find Borradaile translating this verse:—

"One of a different womb, being again associated, may take the succession; not one of a different womb, if not re-united: but [a whole brother *if*] *re-united*, obtains the property; and not [*exclusively*] the son of a different mother."§

Hence, according to Colebrooke a brother united by blood; according to Tagore, a uterine brother, *even when he is separated*, may obtain the property; while according to Borradaile a whole brother may obtain it, but only on the condition of being *re-united*. Again, Colebrooke and Borradaile say that the son of a different mother cannot get the succession *exclusively*, while Tagore says, that a step-brother cannot get it, if *separated*.

Or, under the heading of effects not liable to partition, the Mitâkshará cites a verse from Nârada, which Colebrooke translates:—

"He who maintains the family of a brother studying science, shall take, be he ever so ignorant, a share of the wealth gained by science."‖

In the Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya, Mr. Burnell renders the same verse:—

"A member of a family though he be ignorant, who supports his brother while learning science, shall get a share of the wealth acquired by that brother by learning."¶

And Tagore, in the Vivâdachintâmaṅi:—

"Wealth, acquired by a learned man, whose family was supported, *during his absence from home* to acquire learning, by a brother, shall be shared with the latter, even if he be ignorant."**

Hence, according to Tagore's version a brother acquires this right only when he supports his brother's family during his absence from home—a restriction not contained in Colebrooke's and Burnell's translation of the same passage.

---

* The *italics* in this and the following quotations are intended to facilitate a comparison of the discrepancies.

† XI., 5, 13. ‡ P. 306. § IV., 9, 10. ‖ I., 4, 8.
¶ P. 49. ** P. 253.

Again, when treating of the succession to a woman's peculiar property, Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga quotes a verse of Devala, which according to Colebrooke says:—

"Her subsistence, her ornaments, her perquisite, and *her gains*, are the separate property of a woman. She herself exclusively enjoys it; and her husband has no right to use it, unless in distress."*

But in the Vivâdachintâmaṅi, Tagore renders the same verse thus:—

"Food and vesture, ornaments, perquisites, and *wealth received by a woman from a kinsman*, are her own property;" &c.†

Hence, in Colebrooke's translation the *stridhana* applies to all the gains of a woman; while in that of Tagore—and he italicizes the words "from a kinsman"—it applies solely to the wealth which a woman receives *from a kinsman.*

The word perquisite (sometimes also called "fee") in the foregoing quotations is the Sanskrit *śulka*, and as an item of *stridhana* it is defined in Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga by a reference to Kâtyâyana, which Colebrooke translates as follows:—

"Whatever has been received, as a price, of workmen on houses, furniture and carriages, milking vessels and ornaments, is denominated a fee" (Śulka).‡

In the Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya Mr. Burnell renders this verse as follows:—

"What is received as the price of utensils for the house, or cattle, or milch cows, for personal ornaments or for work, that is called *Śulka.*"§

And Tagore, in the Vivâdachintâmaṅi:—

"The small sums which are received by a woman as the price or rewards of household duties, using household utensils, tending beasts of burden, looking after milch cattle, taking care of ornaments of dress, or superintending servants, are called her perquisites."‖

The claims of a woman on the ground of Śulka would therefore be greatly different according to the rendering by Colebrooke, Burnell, or Tagore of the same authoritative passage.

An outcast, it is well known, is subject to legal disabilities; he is not allowed to testify, and he is excluded from inheritance. Now Sir W. Jones, and after him Tagore,¶ render the verse of Manu, IX., 202, in the following way:—

"But it is just that the heir who knows his duty should give all of

---

* IV., 1, 15. † P. 263. ‡ IV., 3, 19.
§ P. 41. ‖ P. 258. ¶ 'Vivâdach.,' p. 243.

them [viz. relatives who are excluded from inheritance] food and raiment for life without stint, according to the best of his power: he who gives them nothing *sinks assuredly to a region of punishment.*"

But in the *Mitâkshará*,* where this passage from Manu is quoted, Colebrooke renders it:—

"But it is fit, that a wise man should give all of them food and raiment without stint to the best of his power: for he, who gives it not, shall be deemed *an outcast.*"

According to Sir W. Jones and Tagore, such a dereliction of duty would therefore entail a spiritual consequence only, but according to Colebrooke serious legal penalties too.

Without multiplying instances like these, I may now ask how could a judge, without a knowledge of Sanskrit, decide which of these scholars is right, or whether their difference of translation is based on a different reading of the same text, and if so, which of these different readings has a claim to greater authority than the rest? And if he cannot decide this question, what is to become of justice in all those cases that are governed by the law contained in these conflicting versions?

But as a Hindu has clearly a right to have justice done to him according to what are *his* real authorities, it is impossible to forego the question whether the present English translations of the law books can be implicitly relied upon as an equivalent for the originals.

On the whole, I have no doubt they may; and of all translations from Sanskrit into a European language I know of none to which, in my opinion, greater admiration is due than to the translation of Jîmûtavâhana's and Vijnâneśvara's law of inheritance by Colebrooke. So great, indeed, was the conscientiousness of that scholar, so thorough his understanding of the Hindu mind, and so vast and accurate his Sanskrit learning, that there is always the strongest reason for hesitation whenever one might feel disposed to question a rendering of his. And as Colebrooke's authority is still paramount in all law courts which have to deal with Hindu law, the aid afforded by his works to English judges cannot be too highly valued.

But, in the first place, the same high opinion cannot be entertained of all the translations already mentioned, for, with the exception of the version of the Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya by Mr. Burnell, most of them are often too free and vague to be thoroughly reliable; and even the translation of the Vivâdachintâmaṅi by the late Prossonno C. Tagore, is

* II., 10, 5.

often more paraphrastic than is compatible with an accurate rendering of the text.

And in the second place, it should also be remembered that, apart from Burnell's, Tagore's, and Kristnasawmy's translations which appeared a few years ago, and those of Loiseleur Deslongchamps, Stenzler, and Roer, which may likewise be looked upon as relating to our own period, the remaining important works date from the end of the last and the earlier part of the present century, when there was not a single critical edition of any of their originals. Hence, with the MS. materials which have since come to light, with the numerous good editions of law texts to which it is now easy to refer,—I may here only name the admirable edition, by Bharatachandraśiromaṇi, of Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga, with seven commentaries, published under the patronage of P. C. Tagore, the various editions of Yâjñavalkya, with the whole Mitâksharâ, published at Calcutta, Benares, and Bombay, and several editions of Manu, with the commentary of Kullûkabhaṭṭa; in a word,—with the immense progress which Sanskrit studies have made for the last thirty years, both in India and Europe, it would be much more surprising if these translations were still found to stand the test of modern scholarship, than if they were found to fail.

And from this point of view alone must we judge of imperfections which occur, not only in Borradaile, Wynch, and Sutherland, but also in Sir W. Jones's translation of Manu, and even in Colebrooke's translations of the two treatises of Vijñâneśvara and Jîmûtavâhana. Yet that such imperfections exist, whatever the cause may be, is undeniable; and as even the accomplished work of Colebrooke is not entirely exempt from them, it may easily be inferred that they call for the attention of those who are answerable for the administration of the Hindu law.

To illustrate the nature of the imperfections of which I here speak, and which have a material bearing on the law of succession, I will choose some instances from Colebrooke's 'Two Treatises.'

In Jîmûtavâhana,* the right of the female line to succession is laid down in an important text from Vṛihaspati. According to Colebrooke this text runs thus:—

"The mother's sister, *the maternal uncle*, the father's sister, the mother-in-law, and the wife of an elder brother, are pronounced similar to mothers. If they leave no issue of their bodies, nor son [of a rival

* IV., 3, 31.

wife], nor daughter's son, nor son of those persons, the sister's son and the rest shall take their property."

That in a series of female relatives the "*maternal uncle*" should occur, and be declared to be similar to a mother, would in itself be improbable; nor is he really mentioned there; and the mistake seems to have been caused by an omission in the MS. used by Colebrooke; for according to the correct text the passage reads:—

"The mother's sister, *the wife of a maternal uncle, the paternal uncle's wife*, the father's sister, the mother-in-law, and the wife of an elder brother are pronounced similar to mothers. If they leave no issue of their body, nor son, nor daughter's son, nor son of those persons, the sister's son and the rest shall take their property."*

Hence the maternal uncle cannot claim on the ground of this passage, but in his stead the wife of a maternal uncle and the paternal uncle's wife can so claim.

In the same chapter, where the son's prior right to inheritance is mentioned,† a quotation from Vŕiddha-Śâtâtapa is made at the same time to show in what order the succession of other persons is regulated in accordance with the benefits which, through the Śrâddha rites, they may confer on the soul of the deceased. Colebrooke renders the passage as follows:—

"The son's preferable right too appears to rest on his presenting the greatest number of beneficial oblations, and on his rescuing his parent from hell. And a passage of Vŕiddha-Śâtâtapa expressly provides for the funeral oblations of *these women*: 'For the wife of a maternal uncle or of a sister's son, of a father-in-law and of a spiritual parent, of a friend and of a maternal grandfather, as well as for the sister of the mother or of the father, the oblation of food at obsequies must be performed. Such is the settled rule among those who are conversant with the Vedas.'"

The drift of the quotation from Vŕiddha-Śâtâtapa as it stands, would not be intelligible, for Jîmûtavâhana alleges his words, not in order to state *for* whom the Śrâddha should be performed, but *by whom* the benefits are conferred, and thus the title to inheritance in succession is acquired. But according to the words of the correct text, and the interpretation of them in the Dâyanirńaya, the passage from Vŕiddha-Śâtâtapa would have to be rendered thus:—

---

* Calc. 8vo ed., 1829 (p. 154); Bharatach.'s ed. (p. 172): mâtuḱ svasâ [illegible] pitŕisvasâ, śvaśrûḱ pûrvajapatnî cha mâtŕitulyâḱ [illegible] auraso na syât suto dauhitra eva vâ, tatsuto vâ dhanaṁ tasaṁ svasriyâdyâḱ samâpnuyuḱ.

† IV., 3, 36.

" . . . . And a passage of Vṛiddha-Śâtâtapa expressly provides for the funeral oblations of the following persons (*masc.*): the maternal uncle (performs the Śrâddha) for a sister's son, and a sister's son for his maternal uncle, (a son-in-law) for a father-in-law; (a pupil) for a spiritual teacher, (a friend) for a friend, and (a daughter's son) for a maternal grandfather. And also for the wives of these persons, and the sister of a mother and father, the oblation of food at obsequies must be performed. Such, &c."*

The importance of this passage had a recent illustration in the case of Gridhari Lall Roy *v.* the Government of Bengal. Gridhari was the maternal uncle of the father of a deceased Zemindar, whose inheritance he claimed, no other heirs claiming; but as the Bengal Government maintained that there was no law-text under which a maternal uncle could succeed to the property of a sister's son, it held that this was a case of escheat, and the High Court at Calcutta actually delivered a judgment in favour of the Crown. Now, since it has never been denied that a clear duty to perform the Śrâddha implies a right to succeed, there can be no doubt that the judgment of the High Court must have been different, had it been able to avail itself of the correct translation of the passage quoted, proving as that does, the maternal uncle's duty to perform the Śrâddha for a sister's son.

In Jîmûtavâhana,† according to Colebrooke, a grandmother and great grandmother would seem to have no right to succeed, inasmuch as they take no part in the Śrâddha. It is true that the passage alluded to would stand in direct contradiction with others in the same work, where the grandmother's and great grandmother's right is distinctly admitted, but

---

* The original passage, according to the text published in Calc. 1829 (p. 157), and Bharatach.'s edition (p. 175), is as follows:—Mâtulo bhâgineyasya svasrîyo mâtulasya cha, śvaśurasya guroś chaiva sakhyur mâtâmahasya cha, eteshâṁ chaiva bhâryâbhaḥ svasur mâtuḥ pitus tathâ, śrâddhadânaṁ tu kartavyam iti vedavidâṁ sthitir iti Vṛiddha-Śâtâtapavachanât. Amîshâṁ piṇḍadatva-pratipâdanâd ayaṁ piṇḍadânaviśeshâd adhikârakramaḥ.

In the *Dâyakaumudî*, where this passage from Śâtâtapa is quoted (ed. Calc., p. 155), the following comment from the *Dâyanirṇaya* is appended to it: Mâtulo bhâgineyasya piṇḍadaḥ; evaṁ svasrîyo mâtulasya piṇḍadaḥ; śvaśurasya jâmâtâ piṇḍadaḥ; guroḥ piṇḍadâtâ śishyaḥ; mâtâmahasya piṇḍadâtâ dauhitraḥ. Eteshâṁ mâtulâdînâṁ bhâryâbhyaḥ strîbhyaḥ śrâddhadânaṁ kartavyam iti vedârthopanibandhṛiṇâṁ nishṭhâ; iti Dâyanirṇayaḥ.

† XI., 6, 3.

the fact is that no such contradiction results from the original text. Colebrooke's words are :—

"Nor can it be pretended that the stepmother, grandmother and great grandmother take their places at the funeral repast, in consequence of [ancestors being deified] with their wives."

Whereas the correct original text would in the translation run :—

"Nor can it be pretended that a stepmother, a stepmother of a father, and a stepmother of a paternal grandfather, take their places at the funeral repast, in consequence of [ancestors being deified] with their wives."*

In the translation of the Mitâksharâ †—for I will also add an instance or two from this treatise—a curious mistake has been caused by Colebrooke's adopting part of the translation by Sir W. Jones of a passage of Manu, quoted by Vijñâneśvara in support of his rule regarding effects not liable to partition.

"If the horses or the like," Vijñâneśvara says, "be numerous, they must be distributed among coheirs who live by the sale of them. If they cannot be divided, the number being unequal, they belong to the eldest brother, as ordained by Manu." And now follows the quotation from the latter,‡ which Colebrooke has rendered thus :—

"Let them never divide a single goat or sheep, or a single beast with uncloven hoofs : a single goat or sheep belongs to the first-born."

How, on the ground of such a text from Manu, the Mitâksharâ could forbid the division of an unequal number of cattle, would be unintelligible. But what Manu really says is :—

"If goats and sheep, together with beasts that have uncloven feet, are of an unequal number, let no division be made of them ; but let such an unequal number of goats and sheep (*v. l.* let such goat and sheep, with beasts that have uncloven feet,) go to the first-born."

The error arose from the translators mistaking the import of the singular number which is required by Sanskrit compounds to express collectiveness, and which in the case of the Dvandva compound *ajâvikam*

---

* Calc. ed. 1829 (p. 323), Bharatach.'s ed. (p. 332) : Na cha sapatnîkatvena sapatnîmâtuḥ sapatnîpitâmahyâḥ sapatnîprapitâmahyâś cha śrâddhe 'nupraveśaḥ. Compare the analogous passage in the *Vîramitrodaya*, f. 208, *b*, ll. 1 ff.

In this instance a printer's mistake perhaps caused the inaccuracy in Colebrooke's rendering ; for if we read in it "the step- mother, -grandmother," &c., the chief discrepancy would be removed.

† I., 4, 18. ‡ IX., 119.

"goats and sheep" is also interpreted in this sense by the commentator Kullûkabhaṭṭa, with a reference to the grammar of Pâṇini.*

In the chapter which treats of the right of a widow to inherit the estate of one who leaves no male issue, the Mitâksharâ† says:—

"In the first place, the wife shares the estate. 'Wife' (patnî) signifies a woman espoused in lawful wedlock; conformably with the etymology of the term as implying a connexion with religious rites. *The singular number 'wife' (in the text of Yâjñavalkya) signifies the kind; hence if there are several wives belonging to the same or different castes, they divide the property according to the shares (prescribed to them), and take it.*"

The italicized words are entirely omitted in Colebrooke's translation, and as there is no other passage in the Mitâksharâ which relates to the emergency of several wives surviving a man who leaves no male issue, it is needless to point out how important they are in a disputed case of this nature. The omission, I may add, has already been noticed by Mr. Stokes in a note to page 53 of his 'Hindu Law Books,' where he comments on a passage of Borradaile's Vyavahâramayûkha.

I need not enlarge any further on mistakes of this nature, which, as I have already observed, may chiefly have arisen from the imperfect condition of MSS. which were used for the translations; but it is clear that they may become a serious impediment to rightful claims, and obstruct the course of justice.

Apart however from the question, whether a judge could entirely rely on these translations of Sanskrit law texts, it remains to be seen whether, even in their most perfect condition, the existing translations of the Hindu law books could be held to suffice for the settlement of the numerous cases that arise from disputes in matters of Hindu inheritance and adoption.

No one, I think, acquainted with the works enumerated at the commencement of this paper, and with other works of Sanskrit literature quoted by them, would affirm that they *do* suffice. He would, on the contrary, have to own that many law-books, as yet untranslated, are sometimes a material aid, and sometimes even indispensable, for a correct understanding of the Mitâksharâ and the digest of Jîmûtavâhana.

The *Vîramitrodaya*, for instance, is to a large extent a full commentary on the Mitâksharâ, which it copiously quotes; and the same may be

* *Mit.* (I., 4, 18): Ajâvikaṁ saikaśaphaṁ na jâtu vishamaṁ bhajet, ajâvikaṁ tu vishamaṁ [illegible] jyeshṭhasyaiva vidhîyate, iti Manu-smaraṇât.—*Kullûkabhaṭṭa* to *Manu*, IX., 119: ajâvikam iti paśu-dvandvâd vibhâshayaikavadbhâvaḥ (comp. Pâṇ. II., 4, 11).

† II., 1, 5.

said of the *Smŕitichandrikâ*, of which a few years ago not a line had appeared in print, and of which even now a trustworthy translation cannot be said to exist. Again, the seven commentaries on Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga, Raghunandana's Smŕititattva, the treatises of Kamalâkara, the Dâyakaumudî, and kindred works, are in numerous instances the best, if not the only, means for arriving at the precise meaning of its text. And so long as all these works remain untranslated, justice to the Hindus in matters of inheritance must remain uncertain, because it would often have to depend on the reasoning of the European mind, which, failing to appréciate the historical facts and the religious ground on which Hindu reasoning proceeds, must necessarily often become fallacious. In a recent case tried in the High Court at Fort William, the Chief Justice gave the advice, not to introduce English notions into cases governed by Hindu law. "The Hindu law of inheritance," he very justly observed, "is based upon the Hindu religion, and we must be cautious that in administering Hindu law we do not, by acting upon our notions derived from English law, inadvertently wound or offend the religious feelings of those who may be affected by our decisions; or lay down principles at variance with the religions of those whose law we are administering."—(In the High Court of Judicature at Fort William. Ordinary original civil jurisdiction, 1st September, 1869. Gannendro Mohun Tagore *v.* Opendro Mohun Tagore, &c., p. 23.)

Yet how much even judges of the highest standing are liable to err, if, for a knowledge of the positive Hindu law, they substitute that which from an English point of view may appear to be the most logical and faultless reasoning, will be seen by the instance of a Privy Council judgment which, if relied upon as a precedent, would materially alter the whole Hindu law of inheritance in one of its vital points.

The judgment I am here alluding to is that delivered on the 30th of November, 1863, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon the appeal of Kattama Nauchear *v.* the Râjâ of Śivaganga, from the Sudder Devanny Adawlut at Madras.

The object of the litigation was the Zemindary of Śivaganga, situated in the Madras Presidency. Its last owner, who was in undisputed possession of it, had died in 1829, leaving no male issue, but several wives by whom he had daughters; and the daughter of one of those wives was the appellant in the case; for the Sudder Court at Madras had decided against her claims, and pronounced in favour of the respondent, a nephew of the deceased, who at the time of the appeal was in possession of the Zemindary.

The issues of the case, as stated in the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, were these:—

1. Were Gaurivallabha (the deceased Râjâ) and his brother (for the grandson of the latter was the respondent, the Râjâ in possession) undivided in estate, or had a partition taken place between them?

2. If they were undivided, was the Zemindary the self-acquired and separate property of Gaurivallabha (the deceased Râjâ)? And if so—

3. What is the course of succession according to the Hindu law of the south of India of such an acquisition, where the family is in other respects an undivided family?

The first of these questions the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council answered in the sense that the deceased Râjâ and his brother were *undivided* in estate; and this being a question of fact, we have simply to accept their Lordships' finding.

In regard to the second question, the judgment held that the Zemindary was not the ancestral, but the self-acquired and separate property of the late Râjâ; and this, too, being a question of fact, no remark has to be added to it.

Concerning the third, however, which is a question of law, the judgment went on to say, that according to the law in the south of India, as affecting members of an undivided family, the Zemindary would have passed to the nephew had it been ancestral property, but being self-acquired property, the daughter of one of the widows—the appellant in the case—was entitled to it.

Now, in the first place, I must here observe that this judgment is exclusively based on what their Lordships consider to be the law of the Mitâksharâ. That the Mitâksharâ is *one* of the law authorities in the south of India is unquestionable; but it is likewise an undisputed fact that it is not the *primary* authority in that part of India. As before stated, the Mitâksharâ, which is merely a running commentary on the text of Yâjñavalkya, is incomplete in many respects; and amongst the later works which enlarged on it and supplied its defects, the digests called *Smŕitichandrikâ* and *Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya* became the chief authorities in the south. At the time when the Śivaganga case was pending, Mr. Burnell's translation of the Mâdhavîya did not exist, nor even the imperfect version of the Smŕitichandrikâ by Mr. Kristnasawmy Iyer. These works were then accessible only as Sanskrit MSS. Hence not so much as an allusion to them occurs in the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and while it is not denied that the respondent had a right to have his claims dealt with according to the recognized *primary* law of his country, we here meet with the anomalous circumstance that they were decided upon according to what in the south of India is only considered as a secondary source of law.

And that this distinction is not merely a fortuitous one is proved by the case itself. For there is no text in the Mitâksharâ which clearly provides for it, whereas there are passages in the *Smŕitichandrikâ* and the *Mâdhavîya* which, I have no doubt, would have proved to their Lordships' minds that the second question they had raised was irrelevant to the case, and that their final decision was even contrary to the very spirit of the law of the Mitâksharâ.

But as they were not acquainted with the two Digests which, while in perfect accordance with the Mitâksharâ, elucidate its obscurities, their Lordships supplied the apparent defect of the Mitâksharâ with arguments which, from a European point of reasoning, might bear out the conclusion at which they arrived, but from a Hindu point of view do not.

I have already mentioned that the family of the appellant and the respondent were admittedly undivided in estate. Yet in a family of *this* description the judgment of the Judicial Committee raised the question as to what was in it ancestral, and what was self-acquired, property. Such a question, however, cannot judicially occur in an *undivided* family, so long as it remains undivided, which was here the case. The translated text of the Mitâksharâ itself is silent on the law of succession in reference to an undivided family, for the text of Yâjñavalkya, which this commentary follows verse by verse, does not deal with it; and in the first section of its second chapter, which treats of the right of widows to inherit in default of male issue, and on which the judgment in this case is exclusively based, nothing is stated affecting the rights of any member of an undivided family. On the other hand, the *Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya*, and especially the *Smŕitichandrikâ*, very distinctly regulate the succession rights in an undivided family: it results from them that only a male member of such a family can be heir, and that *so long as the family remains undivided*, the whole of the property, whether ancestral or self-acquired, is vested in him.* The reasons of such a law are likewise clear. In an undivided family the principal religious duties are undivided, and the benefits, therefore, to be bestowed on the soul of the deceased ancestor—benefits on which the right of succession rests—can be conferred only by one single member of the family, its actual head. †

Not having before them this distinct law, which is quite in harmony

---

* The question, therefore, what is ancestral and what is self-acquired property, can judicially only occur at the time when division takes place.

† See Appendix.

with the law of Manu and all other legislators, and being left in doubt by a section of the Mitâksharâ, which having nothing whatever to do with the case in question could of course not enlighten them, the Lords of the Judicial Committee laid down a perfectly novel proposition which, if adopted, would alter the basis of the whole Hindu law.

"There are two principles," the judgment says,* "on which the rule of succession, according to the Hindu law, appears to depend: the first is that which determines the right to offer the funeral oblation, and the degree in which the person making the offering is supposed to minister to the spiritual benefit of the deceased; the other is an assumed right of survivorship."

But the fact is, that there is only *one* principle, that stated by the Report in the first proposition, and that the second does not exist at all. Of the first, Sir W. Jones had already said that it contains the key to the *whole* Hindu law of inheritance; and even the single text which the judgment adduces in support of its theory of a right of survivorship, had it been quoted in full, and with the remarks attached to it by the Smṛitichandrikâ, would have shown that no such right can be inferred from it.†

---

* Page 18.

† After the words above quoted ("there are two principles . . . . . right of survivorship") the Report continues:—"Most of the authorities rest the uncontested right of widows to inherit the estates of their husbands, dying separated from their kindred, on the first of these principles (1 Strange, 135). But some ancient authorities also invoke the other principle (viz. that of survivorship). Vṛihaspati (3 Dig. 458, tit. ccccxcix; see also Sir W. Jones' paper cited 2 Strange, 250) says:—'Of him whose wife is not deceased half the body survives; how should another take the property, while half the body of the owner lives?'" The text here quoted by the judgment reads, however, in full, as quoted by the Smṛitichandrikâ, thus:—"In Scripture, in the traditional code, and in popular practice, a wife (*patnî*) is declared by the wise to be half the body (of her husband), *equally sharing the fruit of (his) pure and impure acts* (*i. e.* of virtue and vice). Of him whose wife is not deceased, half the body lives; how then should another take his property while half the body of the owner lives? Although Sakulyas (distant kinsmen), although his father, his mother, and uterine brothers be present, the wife of him who died, leaving no male issue, shall take his share." (The same passage also occurs in Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga, XI., 1, 2, and in Sir W. Jones' paper, 2 Strange, 250, mentioned by the Report.) The Smṛitichandrikâ (Calc. ed., p. 58) *introduces* this passage with the following words:—"Accordingly, after having pronounced that compared to other (relatives) a wife has a nearer claim *on account of the circumstance that she has the property of conferring visible and spiritual benefits* (on the deceased),

The judgment further asks:—"If the first of these principles (the spiritual principle) were the only one involved, it would not be easy to see why the widow's right of inheritance should not extend to her husband's share in an undivided estate."

This question is perfectly pertinent, but it is one of the great points of difference between the Dâyabhâga- and the Mitâksharâ schools. The former assuming that under any conditions the widow would confer the greatest spiritual benefits on the soul of a deceased husband, provided he leaves no male issue, in consequence rules that, in such an emergency, she is *always* entitled to succeed to the property of the husband, whether the latter be divided or not. The Mitâksharâ school, on the contrary, not admitting this superior spiritual power of a widow in an *undivided family*, excludes her from the position she holds in the Dâyabhâga school. But the Śivaganga case fell under the law of the Mitâksharâ school, and it is not for *us* to decide whether the view of the latter regarding the *spiritual* power of a wife is, or is not, more correct than that of the Dâyabhâga school.

In short, "there being no positive text governing the case before the Judicial Committee"*—simply because their Lordships could not refer to the very law authorities conformably to which alone the case should have been decided—they relied on an irrelevant text of the Mitâksharâ, and in applying the law of succession which is applicable only to a divided family, to an undivided one, even mistook this text itself.

That this judgment, if accepted as an authoritative interpretation of the Hindu law, would introduce a second principle, hitherto unknown, into the Hindu right of inheritance, and would entirely alter this law so far as undivided Hindu families are concerned, requires no further re-

---

Vŕihaspati has shown that the wife has the share of her husband's property, if there are no secondary (or adopted) sons, though father and other heirs as far downwards as the Sakulyas may be alive." Again, after having explained the import of the word "wife (*patnî*)" in the passage quoted, the same law authority says:—"Accordingly, the term *patnî* gives us to understand that *her fitness to perform such religious acts, as the rites in honour of the manes, is the reason that she is entitled to take the share of her husband.*" It is clear, therefore, that though "acting upon our notions derived from English law," we might feel induced to infer from the word "lives," in the alleged passage, a right of survivorship, the Hindu mind, and especially the very law authority on which the judgment should have been based, was far from following such a course of reasoning. It looked, on the contrary, upon this passage as confirming the *spiritual* principle, and this principle alone.

* Page 16.

mark. But it seems equally clear that such a result could never have occurred if the Lords of the Judicial Committee had been in possession of more law texts than at the time were accessible to them.

Another instance of the insufficiency of the law texts as hitherto translated, is afforded by the judgment of the High Court of Calcutta in the matter Gridhari Lall Roy *v.* the Government of Bengal, to which I have already had occasion to refer. And as it implies a large class of cases which may equally suffer from the same cause, it will not be deemed superfluous to draw attention to it.

I have just pointed out the great principle on which the Hindu law of inheritance is based. A kind of spiritual bargain is at the root of it. For the *direct* or *indirect* benefit of his future life, a person requires after his death certain religious ceremonies—the Śrâddha—to be performed for him; and since these ceremonies entail expense, his property is supposed to be the equivalent for such expense. A *direct* benefit from the Śrâddha is derived, for instance, by a father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, to whom the funeral cakes are offered by a son, grandson, or great-grandson; and an indirect benefit, by a deceased whose relatives present the funeral cakes to his *maternal*, grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great-grandfather; for by doing so, they perform for him that duty which, when alive, he would have been bound to perform.* Since, however, the nearer a person is related to the deceased, the greater is the direct or indirect benefit which he is able to confer on the latter's soul, the nearer, too, are his claims to the inheritance. But in the same degree as a person owes the Śrâddha to a relative, the purity of his body is also affected by the death of that relative; and the time within which the impurity he suffers in consequence can be removed by certain religious acts, depends therefore on the degree of relationship in which he stood to the deceased. Again, the right of marriage is affected by the degree of relationship, for within certain degrees marriage is strictly forbidden by the Hindu law.

To obtain, therefore, an authoritative explanation of what, to a Hindu, are the degrees of relationship—and on these degrees, again, depends the *order* of succession—we have especially to look to those portions of the codes of law, and those separate treatises, which relate to the performance of the Śrâddha, to the laws concerning impurity and the removal of it, and to the laws of marriage. All that occurs in regard to these important topics under the head of inheritance is but incidentally stated

* See *e. g. Jîmûtavâhana*, XI., 1, 34; XI., 6, 13.

there, as serving the argument in point, but not with a view of being an exhaustive treatment of the matter. On the whole, there is but little to be gathered from the chapter of inheritance regarding the *relative* rights of heirs; and if the number of such heirs is large, and the degrees of their affinity are intricate, there would be a considerable difficulty in deducing from the general argument merely, the precise right of a particular heir.

Now, in a complete code of law like that of Manu or Yâjñavalkya the subject of Śrâddha, impurity and marriage, is dealt with in the *âchâra* and *prâyaśchitta* (the first and third) portions of the work, not in the second, a portion of which is devoted to inheritance. But as of the commentatorial works on Manu, of the whole Mitâkshará on the first and third books of Yâjñavalkya, of the great work of Raghunandana, and of the numerous important works and treatises dealing with these topics, such as the Nirńayasindhu, Dharmasindhusâra, Śrâddhaviveka, Śrâddhanirńaya, Âchâradarśa, and many others, nothing whatever as yet exists in translation, it may easily be surmised that judges unable to read these works in the original language are deprived of a very important means of deciding on the relative rights of claimants to successions, and that in many instances their decisions may be at fault; for I do not think that, without a positive knowledge of the Hindu religion in its greatest detail, any European could undertake to say whether, for instance, a brother confers more or less benefit on the soul of a brother than his daughter's son; or whether a maternal grandmother on the father's side enjoys that privilege in a higher or lower degree than a paternal grandmother on the mother's side. In the judgment of the High Court at Calcutta, on the case to which I am about to attach some remarks, the learned judges indeed say: "It would be difficult for a person at the present day to give a clear and intelligible reason for many of the eccentricities and anomalies which characterize Hindu law of all schools, and this notwithstanding the encomium of the Pleader on its stern logic and uncompromising adherence to principles once laid down." * But what in this passage is called "eccentricities and anomalies," is nothing but the consequence of the religious views on which the Śrâddha ceremonies rest. It is certainly difficult—nay, impossible—to understand this consequence without a knowledge of its cause, but the latter once mastered in its detail, I believe that "the encomium of the Pleader" would not be found an exaggerated one.

---

* Gridhari Lall Roy *v.* the Bengal Government. 'Record,' p. 98.

The case in question is the one already alluded to,* and the judgment which the High Court at Calcutta passed on it is highly instructive in several respects, for it tells us that a maternal uncle is to a Hindu no heir at all, even if no other relatives of the deceased dispute his claim. To understand this extraordinary finding, it is necessary to see from what premises it was deduced.

According to the degrees of relationship, the old lawgivers divided heirs into three categories, the first being that of the *Sapiṅḍas*, or kindred connected by the *Piṅḍa* or the funeral cake offered at the Śrâddha, and extending to the seventh degree (including the survivor) in the ascending and descending male line; the second, consisting of the *Samânodakas*, or kindred connected by the libation of (udaka) water only offered at the Śrâddha, who extend to the fourteenth degree; and the third, comprising the so-called *Bandhus* or *Bândhavas*, who, in the chapter of the Mitâksharâ and the Dâyabhâga treating of them, Colebrooke generally renders *cognates*. It was as one of the last category that Gridhari claimed as the maternal uncle of the father of a deceased Zemindar. But the judges of the High Court of Bengal did not allow the claim, on the ground that he was excluded from the right of inheritance by the definition given of the term *bandhu*, in the sixth section of the second chapter of the Mitâksharâ. The passage on which the judgment relied runs thus:—

"*Bandhus* (cognates) are of three kinds; related to the person himself, to his father, or to his mother: as is declared by the following text. 'The sons of his own father's sister, the sons of his own mother's sister, and the sons of his own maternal uncle, must be considered as *his own Bandhus*. The sons of his father's paternal aunt, the sons of his father's maternal aunt, and the sons of his father's maternal uncle, must be deemed *his father's Bandhus*. The sons of his mother's paternal aunt, the sons of his mother's maternal aunt, and the sons of his mother's maternal uncle, must be reckoned *his mother's Bandhus*.'"†

Now, as in this list the *sons* of a father's maternal uncle are called *Bandhu*, but not the father's maternal uncle himself, and as Gridhari did not pretend that he was either a *Sapiṅḍa* or a *Samânodaka*, he was nowhere.

His plea was, that the enumeration contained in the quoted text was *not an exhaustive one*, but merely an illustration of the line in which relatives called *Bandhu* must be sought for; that a father's maternal uncle stood in the same position to *his* son (named in that list) as a maternal uncle to *his* (also named there); and since a maternal uncle, he argued,

* P. 13. † Two Treatises, &c., p. 352.

was clearly intended to be included in the list, a father's maternal uncle belonged to the relatives of the Bandhu category. The correctness of the analogy was admitted by the judgment,* but it still denied that a maternal uncle *was* intended to be included in the list. The Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, admitting the appellant's plea, reinstated him in his right, and there can be no question that they did justice to his claim; but as the arguments on which their judgment was based would have been stronger, and would have been less hypothetical, than they now are, had their Lordships been able to avail themselves of more and of safer texts than were at their disposal, and as neither the Bengal Government could ever have claimed the inheritance of Woopendro, nor the High Court of Calcutta pronounced against the Bandhu quality of a "maternal uncle," had they possessed the same advantage, it falls within the scope of this paper to illustrate by this case the serious deficiencies which in the present administration of the Hindu law must be unavoidable.

There were several ways of ascertaining whether the list of Bandhus relied upon by the Bengal Government, was an exhaustive one or not; or in other words, whether a father's maternal uncle and a maternal uncle were included in, or excluded from, it.

The first was to consult any of the works authoritatively treating of the duty of persons to perform the Śrâddha, or of impurity which would affect relatives in consequence of a death, for as all such persons are eventually heirs, it would have been seen at once whether the few individuals named in the quoted text could possibly have been intended for an *exhaustive* definition of the Bandhu category. Now, in all such works, *e. g.* the Dharmasindhusâra, the Nirńayasindhu, Raghúnandana's Śuddhitattva, &c., this category comprises all the connections on the mother's side up to the seventh degree in the ascending and descending line; and I may almost say, as a matter of course, the maternal uncle is distinctly mentioned by them. Even the passage from Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga, adduced above,† might of itself have proved that in the absence of nearer relatives the "maternal uncle" has the right of performing the funeral rites for a sister's son, and it would have confirmed a similar conclusion resulting from the same Digest,‡ for in regard to a question like this there is no difference between the various schools. The judgment of the Judicial Committee says: §—"Mr. Forsyth, indeed, argued strongly against the right of the appellant to inherit, on the assumption that he was

* Record, p. 96, line 62.
† P. 13.
‡ XI., 6, 12 and 13.
§ P. 3.

not entitled to offer the funeral oblations. But is this assumption well founded? There is evidence, the uncontradicted evidence of the family priest and others, that the appellant did, in point of fact, perform the shradh of Woopendro; and he seems, in the judgment of the priest, properly to have performed that function in the absence of any nearer kinsman." But the judgment adds:—"It is, however, unnecessary to determine whether this act of the appellant was regular or not. The issue in this case is not between two competing kinsmen, but between a kinsman of the deceased and the Crown." Yet on the *regularity* of this act all really depends, since the right of performing the Śrâddha and that of succeeding are convertible terms, and, in the extreme case of an escheat to the Crown, even the king inherits only on the condition that he provides for the funeral rites of the person to whom he succeeds, and the king is debarred from succession to a Brâhman's property, because a man of the second or an inferior caste cannot minister to the soul of one of the first. That the family priest allowed the appellant to perform the Śrâddha for his nephew, certainly raised a strong presumption in favour of the maternal uncle's right to do so; but the *certainty* whether he really possessed this right could be established only on the ground of authoritative texts.

The second mode of settling the doubt consisted in referring to the decision of other authorities of the Mitâksharâ school; and of these, it would have been found that, for instance, the *Vivâdachintâmaṅi*, after quoting the same passage describing the three categories of Bandhus, as the Mitâksharâ, sums up its discussion by giving a list of heirs, amongst whom "the *maternal uncle and the rest*" correspond with the Bandhus of the Mitâksharâ.* The Lords of the Judicial Committee had the advantage of being able to resort to this method, since an important passage from the *Vîramitrodaya*—a digest which, as already observed, is often a full commentary on the Mitâksharâ—was accessible to them in a translation given at p. 15 of the Record; and they very justly referred to it in order to show that this authority included "the maternal uncle" in the Bandhu list alleged by the Mitâksharâ. But it so happened that they had ground to suspect the correctness of the translation of this passage in one particular, and in consequence amended it hypothetically where it appeared to them to be at fault. Their conjecture was perfectly right; but as this was the only passage of the kind from works of the Mitâksharâ school, on which they had to rely for *this* argument, it would doubtless

* See Tagore, pp. 298, 299; Sanskrit text, Calc. 1837, pp. 155, 156: . . . . vyavahitasakulyas tadabhâve mâtulâdiḥ.

have been much more satisfactory had they been in possession of an authoritative translation of the work to which the passage belongs.*

The third and most accurate course of all was to ascertain whether the author of the Mitâkshará himself, by whose law the case was governed, elsewhere gave a definition of the term used by him, since, according to the first principle of interpretation, such a definition would necessarily remove all doubts. That the Lords of the Judicial Committee and the learned judges below endeavoured to adopt this course also, it is needless to say; but for the reasons already explained, the materials at their disposal did not enable them to arrive at anything like a safe conclusion.

One obstacle that lay in their way arose from the fact, that Colebrooke in his 'Two Treatises' had accidentally varied the translation of the term Bandhu, and therefore made its identification in several places impossible. Thus in the *Mitâkshará*, II., 1, 2; 5, 3; 6, 1 and 2, and in *Jîmûtavâhana*, XI., 1, 4; and 6, 12, he had rendered *bandhu* 'cognate,' or 'cognate kindred'; but in *Mitâkshará*, II., 7, 1, 'relations'; in II., 12, 1 and 2, 'relatives'; in II., 11, 6, 'kindred,' and 'relations'; and in *Jîmûtavâhana*, XI., 1, 5, 'kinsmen.' Had he not done so, the learned

---

* The [illegible] (p. 7):—"After stating that the term 'Sakulya' or distant [illegible] in the text of Manu, comprehends the three kinds of cognates, the commentator goes on to say,—'The term cognates (*Bandhus*) in the text of Jogishwara must comprehend also the maternal uncles and the rest, otherwise the maternal uncles and the rest would be omitted, and their sons would be entitled to inherit, and not they themselves, though nearer in the degree of affinity, a doctrine highly objectionable.' The passage as translated at p. 15 of the Record has '*then* they themselves,' in place of '*not* they themselves.' If this be the correct reading, it would follow that even if the exclusion of the maternal uncle and others not mentioned in the text relied upon by the respondents from the list of Bandhus were established, they would still, as relations, be heirs, whose title would be preferable to that of the king." But oddly enough, at p. 24 of the Record where a translation of the same passage from the Vîramitrodaya occurs, the last words read: "and *then* they themselves, though *never* in the degree of affinity. A doctrine highly objectionable. Quoted from the Beermithodoya." According to the Sanskrit text of the Vîramitrodaya (Calc. 1815, p. 209, *b*. l. 8) there can be no doubt that "not they themselves" is the correct rendering; and that "*never*" is probably a misprint for "*nearer*"; yet as it is a common occurrence in the Indian courts that Paṅḍits consulted by the litigants differ in their rendering of the same text (compare also the note to p. 28) how is a judge, not knowing Sanskrit, to decide which rendering is legitimate?

judges at Calcutta and the Lords of the Judicial Committee would have found that in its commentary on the verse where Yâjñavalkya says that "in a case of disputed partition the truth should be ascertained by the evidence of relatives called *jñâti*, relatives called *bandhu*, by (other) witnesses, written proof or separate possession of house or field," the Mitâkharâ * explains relatives called jñâti, "bandhus on the father's side"; relatives called *bandhu*, "bandhus on the mother's side, viz. the maternal uncle and the rest."† And this definition of *bandhu* is sub-

* II., 12, 2.

† *Yâjñ.*, II., 150: vibhâganihnave jñâtibandhusâkshyabhilekhitaiḥ, vibhâgabhâvanâ jñeyâ gṛihakshetraiś cha yautukaiḥ; whereupon the *Mit.* in both *Calcutta* editions (1815 and 1829) remarks: vibhâgasya nihnave 'palâpe, jñâtibhiḥ pitṛibandhubhiḥ sâkshibhir mâtulâdibhir mâtṛibandhubhiḥ pûrvoktalakshaṇaiḥ, &c.; in the *Benares* ed. (1853), vibhâgasya nihnave 'palâpe, jñâtibhiḥ pitṛibandubhir mâtulâdibhiḥ sâkshibhiḥ pûrvoktalakshaṇaiḥ, &c.; in the *Bombay* ed. (1863), vibhâgasya nihnave 'palâpe jñâtibhiḥ pitṛibandubhir mâtṛibandhubhir mâtulâdibhiḥ sâkshibhiḥ pûrvoktalakshanaiḥ, &c. In the *Benares* edition the word *mâtṛibandhubhiḥ* is evidently by mistake omitted before mâtulâdibhiḥ; and in the *Bombay* edition the order of the text-words of Yâjñav., *jñâti, bandhu, sâkshin*, is more closely followed than in the Calcutta editions, where the order is *jñâti, sâkshin, bandhu*. But unless in the latter editions this inversion is the printer's mistake only—which is very possible on account of the severing of sâkshibhiḥ and pûrvoktalakshaṇaiḥ—it may have been intended to show that *pitṛibandhubhiḥ* is the explanation of *jñâtibhiḥ*, and *mâtulâdibhiḥ, mâtṛibandhubhiḥ*, that of *bandhubhiḥ*, whereas otherwise it might be supposed (as Colebrooke did), that *jñâtibhiḥ* had been left unexplained, and pitṛibandhubhir mâtulâdibhir mâtṛibandhubhiḥ were the words explaining *bandhubhiḥ*. That the former view, however, is the correct one, results from the following parallel passages in which the text of Yâjñ. is commented upon: *Vîramitrodaya* (p. 223 *a*, l. 4, 5), vibhâgasya nihnave 'palâpe vibhaktamadhye kenachit kṛite jñâtibhiḥ [illegible], bandhubhir mâtulâdibhiḥ, sâkshibhiḥ, &c.; *Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya* (MSS.), jñâtayaḥ pitṛibândhavâḥ, bândhavâs tu mâtulâdayaḥ (*v. l.* mâtṛibândhavâś cha; or without *cha*); *Jîmûtavâhana* (p. 359), prathamaṃ jñâtayaḥ sapiṇḍâḥ sâkshiṇaḥ, tadabhâve bandhupadopanîtâḥ sambandhinaḥ, tadabhâva udâsînâ api sâkshiṇaḥ (comp. 'Two Treatises,' p. 237; ch. xiv., § 3). Hence Colebrooke's rendering of Mit., II., 12, § 2, "if partition be denied or disputed, the fact may be known and certainty be obtained by the testimony of kinsmen, relatives of the father or of the mother, such as maternal uncles and the rest, being competent witnesses as before described"—has to be altered into: "if partition be denied or disputed, the fact may be known and certainty be obtained by (the testimony of) relatives called *jñâti*, viz. the bandhus on the father's side; or (that of) relatives called *bandhu*, viz. the bandhus on the mother's side, such as maternal uncles and the rest, or (other) witnesses, as before described."

stantially therefore the same as that given by the Mitâksharâ,* where it defines *bandhu* as "a Sapiṅḍa of a different family," † that is, a Sapiṅḍa on the mother's side. Nor does Jîmûtavâhana differ on this point from the Mitâksharâ school, for when speaking of the sense in which Yâjñavalkya understood the word *bandhu*, he says, ‡ "to intimate that the *maternal uncle* shall inherit in consequence of the proximity of oblations, as presenting offerings to the maternal grandfather and the rest, which the deceased was bound to offer, Yâjñavalkya employs the term *bandhu*."

But there are other passages, also, in the Mitâksharâ which clearly show that its author did not intend to quote the list of the three categories of Bandhus as an exhaustive one. They are contained, however, in that portion of the Mitâksharâ not translated by Colebrooke. One of these had been supplied to the High Court at Calcutta for the purposes of the suit, but was singularly misunderstood by it. In Book II., v. 264, Yâjñavalkya where speaking of co-traders lays down this rule; "if one (of them) having gone to a foreign country, dies, let the heirs, the *bándhavas*, *jñâtis*, or those who have come, take the property; and in their default the king." Whereupon the Mitâksharâ comments: "When of partners 'one who has gone to a foreign country dies,' then let 'the heirs,' that is, his son or other lineal descendants; 'the *bândhavas*,' that is, *the relatives on the mother's side*, viz. *the maternal uncle and the rest*; 'the *jñâtis*,' that is Sapiṅḍas, except the lineal descendants; 'or those who have come,' that is, the partners in business who have come from the foreign country, take his share; and 'in their default,' that is, in default of 'the heirs,' &c., let the king take it."§

---

* II., 5, 3.

† Bhinnagotrâṅâṁ sapiṅḍânâṁ bandhuśabdena grahaṅât.

‡ XI., 6, 12.

§ The translation of this passage as given by me above differs from that which the Bengal Government had laid before the High Court, and it also differs from that tendered by the Appellant to the Court. The Record (p. 97) says:

"The words are, as translated by the Defendant, Respondent [*i. e.* the Bengal Government]:—

"*Text.*—'When one dies in a foreign country, let the descendants (Bundhoos), cognates, gentiles, or his companions, take the goods, or, in their [illegible],'

"*Commentary.*—'When he who is gone to a foreign country, of those who are associated in trade, dies, then his share should be inherited by his heirs, *i. e.* the son and other descendants, *viz.*, (Bundhoos) cognates, *i. e.*, those on the mother's side, the maternal uncle, and others, *viz.*, the gentiles, *i. e.*, the Sapindahs, besides the son and other descendants, and

In this passage the High Court at Calcutta declared "The words, maternal uncle and the rest," to be "an insertion over and above what is contained in the principal text as to Bundhoos"; and added: "Under these circumstances, as the translated passage refers to an exceptional state of things, it may be that the ordinary succession has been interfered with in a particular other than that above suggested, though the succession professes to follow the ordinary course in all other particulars save one."*

It need scarcely be observed that there is not the slightest ground

---

those who are come, *i. e.*, those among them associated in trade, from a foreign country, or in their default, the king shall take.' "

No wonder that the Appellant objected to this jumble of words, where in the '*Text*,' 'Bundhoos' would be an explanation of 'descendants,' instead of 'cognates'; and in the *Commentary*, too, 'Bundhoos' and 'gentiles' are made to explain the same word 'descendants'; and the word 'besides' is intended for '*except*.' But neither is the Appellant's version unobjectionable. It is given after the foregoing quotation, by the Record, in these words:

"*Text.*—A person having gone to a foreign country, his goods would be taken by his heir, and those related *through a Bundhoo, or to a Bundhoo* or agnatic relation, or person returning from that country. In default of heirs, the king will take." And his translation of the Commentary of the Mitâkharâ is as follows:

"When a person from amongst the persons trading in fellowship, or common stock, goes to a foreign country and dies there, his share will be taken by his heir, *i. e.* offspring, *i. e.* son and other offspring, Bundhoos, relations on the mother's side, maternal uncles, and the rest, or others, agnatic relations, that is to say, Sapindas, other than offspring, or by those coming back. Those who amongst the co-traders return from a foreign country, shall take; in default of them, the king."

If this version were correct (I am not here alluding to the last sentence which is perhaps misprinted for ". . . . coming back; *viz.* those who . . . ."), the *text* of Yâjñavalkya would treat of persons who are "related *through a Bandhu*, or *to a Bandhu*," while the *commentary* of the Mitâkharâ would speak of Bandhus only; and as the words "related through a Bandhu, or to a Bandhu" are meant for Yâjñavalkya's word *bândhava*, it would follow that relatives called *bândhava* are more distant heirs than those called *bandhu*. Nor should I feel surprised if possibly a doubt of this kind had some influence on the High Court, when, as we shall see, it founded a very strange theory on this passage. But *bândhava*, though a derivative of *bandhu*, has absolutely the same sense as the latter, as results, not only from all the law-commentaries, but also from the grammatical Gaṇa prajñâdi to *Pâṇini* V. 4, 38.—Here then are two litigants, both differently rendering the same important text to which they appeal; and a Law Court, unable to examine this text in the original, is to decide which of them is right, or whether both are wrong!

* Record, p. 98.

for such a theory; and the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council very justly remarks (p. 7): "Their Lordships cannot admit the reasonableness of this hypothesis, and think that even on the Mitâkshará the question under consideration is at least uncertain." Yet instead of affording *absolute* proof that the definition here given by the Mitâkshará of the term *bândhava* or *bandhu* is in accordance with the definition which the same work *everywhere* gives when it thinks proper to paraphrase the word *bandhu*, and that consequently no new definition was here intended for an "exceptional state of things," the judgment of the Judicial Committee proceeds to fortify its position by the passage, above alleged, from the Vîramitrodaya, and therefore does *not* remove the doubt whether the Mitâkshará itself countenanced the theory objected to or not.

Yet one such definition of *bandhu*, literally agreeing with that in the passage just quoted, might have been found in the passage mentioned before;* and another, occurring in another, untranslated portion of the Mitâkshará, is still more explicit; for it distinctly refers to the very passage in question, which contains the Bandhu list, and settles therefore even the last remnant of uncertainty.

In Book III., v. 24, Yâjñavalkya, treating of the season of impurity caused by the death of friends, says: "Purification lasts a day when a guru dies, or a boarder, a vedic teacher, a *maternal uncle* or a Brâhman versed in one vedic school." On which words the Mitâkshará remarks: "'Guru' means a spiritual teacher; 'boarder,' a pupil; 'vedic teacher,' him who explains the Vedângas. By the word '*maternal uncle*,' the relatives on the female side, viz. the bandhus of one's self, the mother's bandhus, and the father's bandhus are implied; and who these are has been shown in (the commentary on) the verse of Yâjñavalkya, which begins with the words, 'the wife and the daughters,'" † that is, on the very same verse, II., 135 (Coleb., p. 324), to which the whole commentary of Sects. 1–7 of ch. ii. of the Mitâkshará, and consequently also that of Sect. 6 (Coleb., p. 352) belongs.

In short, the maternal uncle, so far from being *excluded* from the *Bandhus*, is almost invariably named as the very type of the whole category; and what relative indeed on the mother's side could have a nearer claim to that title than he?

Now that in spite of such overwhelming evidence, even in one of the

---

* P. 27, l. 7.

† Mâtulagrahaṅenâtmabandhavo mâtṛibandhavaḥ pitṛibandhavaś cha yonisambaddhâ upalakshyante, te cha patní duhitara ity atra darśitâḥ.

clearest cases possible, any law-court could nonsuit a claimant simply because the mass of proof which would have supported his right, was not accessible in English to the judge, appears to involve so anomalous a state of things that its continuance must be thought to be very undesirable.

The best and most efficient means of remedying it would of course be a thorough acquaintance of the Indian judges with the *original* text of the Hindu law literature, and their ability to examine for themselves in the original language all the texts which may have a bearing on a case before them. Nor need such a remedy be looked upon as chimerical; for the study of Sanskrit required for a legal training to this end would not imply more than the labour of a few years.

But as some time might have to elapse before this object could be attained, it is at least to be hoped that the most immediate wants pointed out in this paper will be provided for by the competent authorities.

A thorough revision of all the translations of Hindu law texts hitherto used in the Indian Courts should be undertaken at once, not in order to set them completely aside, but with the view of correcting their mistakes while preserving all that is good in them, and of harmonizing their quotation of the same texts so as to render the identification of the latter possible.

And, besides, the most important works, as yet accessible only in Sanskrit, should be translated into English, so that at least the whole of Yâjñavalkya's Code, with the Mitâkshará, the Víramitrodaya, some commentaries of Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga, some of Raghunandana's Tattvas, the Nirńayasindhu, the Dharmasindhusâra, the principal treatises on Śrâddha, impurity, and marriage, and those on adoption, should soon be within the reach of an English judge.

The study of Sanskrit is now so successfully pursued in India, and native scholarship has already given such excellent proof of its mastery both of Sanskrit and English, that with united efforts in India itself, there would be no difficulty, within a few years' time, in accomplishing this greatly needed work.

APPENDIX TO PAGE 18.

THE oldest Hindu lawgivers lay down the rule that members of a united family have a joint community of worldly and spiritual interests. Hence, according to them, their income and expenditure is conjoint; they cannot individually accept or bestow gifts, or make loans; nor can they reciprocally bear testimony, or become sureties for one another; moreover, certain of their religious duties being undivided, one member of the family only is entitled and obliged to perform them for the rest. Accordingly, in doubtful cases it was held that partition of a family was proved, if it could be shown that all or any of these criteria of union were wanting. The requirements of an advancing civilization, however, led to a more definite explanation of this general rule. Trade, commerce, or similar causes, often compelling co-parceners to live away from home, or in different houses, the whole of their affairs could not be managed conjointly, nor could *all* their religious duties be performed in common. The difficulties, therefore, of determining from the criteria already alluded to whether a family was a divided or a united one, multiplied in time, and the works of Colebrooke, Strange, Macnaghten, and Grady very justly dwell on them.* A more recent work, however, that by Mr. R. West and Dr. J. G. Bühler,† is not satisfied with admitting, as its predecessors had done, that there are difficulties which must be dealt with according to their merits and as they arise; it summarily rejects *all* the criteria or 'signs of separation,' mentioned by the native authorities, as inconclusive, and consequently as devoid of value in a legal sense.

"The will of the united co-parceners to effect a separation," the Editors

---

* See Mr. Standish Grove Grady's 'Treatise on the Hindoo Law of Inheritance' (1869), where, in Sec. ix., pp. 415 ff., on 'Evidence of Partition,' all that relates to this subject is very carefully collected. See also the 'Manual of Hindu Law,' by the same learned author (1871), Sec. ix., pp. 273 ff.

† A Digest of Hindu Law; from the replies of the Shastris in the several Courts of the Bombay Presidency. Book II. Partition. Bombay, 1869. As this work reached me after the foregoing paper had been read to the East India Association, the translation of the chapter of the Vîramitrodaya "On a woman's separate property," contained in its Appendix (pp. 67 ff.), was then unknown to me, and has to be added to the translation of Hindu Law Texts enumerated at pp. 5 and 6.

of this Digest say,* "may be (1) stated explicitly; (2) or implied. As to express will it may be evidenced by documents or by declarations before witnesses . . . ." And "as to implied will," they continue,† "the Hindu authors are prolix in their discussions of the circumstances, from which separation or union may be inferred. According to them the 'signs' of separation are:—(*a*) the possession of separate shares; (*b*) living and dining apart; (*c*) commission of acts incompatible with a state of union, such as trading with or lending money to each other, or separately to third parties, mutual gifts or suretyship. They add also giving evidence for each other, but from this in the present day no inference can be deduced. (*d*) The separate performance of religious ceremonies, *i.e.* of the daily Vaiśvadeva, or food-oblation in the fire preceding the morning-meal; of the Naivedya, or food-oblation placed before the tutelary deity; of the two daily morning and evening burnt-offerings; of the Śrâddhas, or funeral oblations to the parents' manes, &c." The Editors then add: "None of these signs of separation can be regarded as, by itself, conclusive"; and again they say:‡ "As no one of the marks of partition above enumerated can be considered conclusive, so neither can it be said that any particular assemblage of these alone will prove partition. It is in every case a question of fact to be determined like other questions of fact, upon the whole of the evidence adduced, circumstantial evidence being sufficient."

But here it must first be asked what the Editors of this Digest call 'evidence' in addition to that admitted by them as such under the head of "express will"? For, if none of the evidence afforded by the 'signs of separation,'—whether this evidence be taken by itself or combined,—can, as they assert, establish a proof of partition, what evidence is there left but "documents" or "declarations before witnesses"?§ Yet as denial of separation, and litigation ensuing on it, will rarely occur when the party interested in the denial knows that his opponent is in possession of a partition deed, or can produce witnesses before whom the intention to separate has been formally declared, and as under such circumstances it will offer no difficulty to a judge, while, on the other hand, the cases presenting a real difficulty will just be those in which no documentary or other evidence of a similar nature exists,—it is hard to appreciate the value of the advice which the Editors afford in their last quoted words. But as the most striking part of their statement consists in the summary rejection, as legal proof, of all and each of the "signs of separa-

* Introduction, p. xii.
† P. xiii.
‡ P. xv.
§ P. xii.

tion,"—whereas some of these are so strongly relied upon by the native authorities, and have been so cautiously spoken of by Colebrooke, Strange, Grady, and other European writers of eminence,—it will not be inexpedient to inquire whether in this matter a judge may henceforth feel entitled to dispense with a knowledge of all that is stated on this point in Hindu works, and simply content himself with endorsing the opinion of the Editors of the Bombay Digest.

One of the most prominent "signs of separation," as we have seen, is based on religious grounds. It concerns the joint or separate performance of certain religious rites, some of which are mentioned in the quotation just given from the Bombay Digest. In regard to the legal irrelevance of these, the Editors of this Digest even grow emphatic. "The separate performance of the Vaiśvadeva sacrifice, of Śrâddhas and other religious rites," they say,* "is still less conclusive," viz. than the "living and dining apart" previously spoken of and declared by them to be "not conclusive of the fact" of separation. They seem to arrive at this inference from the interrogatory connected with a case to which they refer, and from a passage of a native authority to which they point, as forming part of their remarks on this case.

The case is that reported by them at p. 58. It gave rise, on the part of the Court, to the following amongst other questions: "He [viz. the son of an elder wife] was in the habit of performing the sacrifice called Vaiśvadeva on his own account. Should he be considered a separated member of the family? and can any man whose food is cooked separately perform the ceremony, or is it a sign of separation?" Upon which the Paṅdit so questioned replied:† "Those members of a family who individually perform the ceremonies of Vaiśvadeva and Kuladharma, and have signed a Fârikhat, may be considered separated. It does not appear from the Shastras that the elder son of a person is obliged to perform the Vaiśvadeva on his own account, although his father and stepbrother are united in interests and he himself lives and cooks his food separately in the same town without receiving the share of his ancestral property. A person may, however, perform the ceremony by the permission of his father."

On this reply of the Paṅdit the Editors again observe:‡ "The Shastri is right in not considering the separate performance of the Vaiśvadeva as a certain sign of 'partition,' though it is enumerated in the Smṛitis among these signs. The general custom is, in the present day, that even undivided coparceners, who take their meals separately,

* P. xiv. † P. 59. ‡ P. 60.

perform this ceremony, at least once every day, each for himself, because it is considered to purify the food." But here it may be observed that all the Paṅḍit really said was, that when a man lives and cooks his food apart from his father and stepbrother who are united, it does not appear from the Shastras that he is *obliged* to perform the Vaiśvadeva on his own account; and what follows therefore from his words is, that if, living apart from his relatives, he *were* obliged to perform the Vaiśvadeva, such an *obligation* would prove that there was *no union* between him and the relatives named. The real drift of his answer, therefore, was not to show, as the Editors suppose, that the separate performance of the Vaiśvadeva was *in no case* a "certain sign of partition," but to recommend to the Court the investigation of the fact whether the person in question was or was not "*obliged*" to perform this ceremony separately from his relatives.

In a note on the word Vaiśvadeva the Editors had previously said * that "this ceremony is performed for the sanctification of food before dinner," and after the words above quoted (" . . . . . because it is considered to purify the food"), they continue: "We subjoin a passage on this point from the *Dharmasindhu*:† (Dharm. f. 90, p. 2, l. 3 and 6 Bombay lith. ed.): *juhuyât sarpishâbhyaktair gṛihye 'gnau laukike 'pi vâ, yasminn agnau pached annaṁ tasmin homo vidhîyate. Avibhaktânâm pâkabhede pṛithag vaiśvadevaḥ kṛitâkṛita iti bhaṭṭojîye;* 'Rice mixed with clarified butter should be offered in the sacred domestic fire, or in a common fire. The oblations (at the Vaiśvadeva) should be made in that fire, with which the food is cooked . . . . . Bhaṭṭojîdîkshita declares that, if members of an undivided family prepare their food separately, the Vaiśvadeva-offering may be performed separately (in each household) or not."

Their remark, however, regarding the purpose of the Vaiśvadeva, as well as their quotation from the Dharmasindhusâra and their translation of it, are very inaccurate. For, as will presently be seen, the Dharmasindhusâra states that the object of the Vaiśvadeva is the consecration of one's self *and* of the food; whereas the Mitâkshará, in commenting on Yâjñavalkya, I., v. 103, altogether contests the doctrine that the V. is intended for the consecration of the food, and after some discussion on this theory, arrives at the conclusion that it solely concerns the (spiritual) benefit of the person performing it. And as in quoting from the Dharmasindhusâra the Editors in the beginning of the passage alleged

* P. 59.

† An abbreviation, by the Editors, of *Dharmasindhusâra*, which is the full name of the work meant, by *Kâśînâtha*.

have left out half a verse which *essentially* belongs to it, while before the words ascribed to Bhaṭṭoji they have omitted another *material* portion of the text, their translation is not only incorrect, but the very ground on which the author of the Dharmasindhusâra adduced Bhaṭṭoji, has been misunderstood by them.* But even supposing that all the remarks of the Editors on the Vaiśvadeva were correct, they would still not prove anything in respect of the legal inconclusiveness of "Srâddhas and other religious rites," all of which are included in their sweeping assertion which sets these rites aside for the purpose of legal evidence.

As the object of this paper, however, is not to correct the mistakes of any individual writer, but to show how necessary it is that a judge should examine for himself all that the native authorities teach in regard to questions that may come before him, and how the very replies of even the most learned Paṅḍits may be conducive to fallacies—since the correctness of a reply mainly depends on the correctness and pertinence of the question put, — I will, as an illustration of the difficulties which beset this subject, add a translation of a few passages from three works only, since even these will clearly prove that the bearing of the performance of certain religious ceremonies on the question of union or division cannot be dispatched in the offhand manner implied in the ruling of the Bombay Digest.

In treating of the daily religious duties of a Hindu the *Dharmasindhusâra* under the heading 'on the duty of the fifth division' (of a day divided into eight parts) contains the following passage: †

"The Vaiśvadeva is to be performed for the removal of (sins committed in) the five *Śûnâs*. The five *Śûnâs* are the five places where injury may be done (to living beings); viz. the wooden mortar in which grain is threshed; the stone slab on which condiments, &c., are ground with a muller; a fire-place; a water-jar, and a broom.‡ The commencement of

* The essential words omitted before '*juhuyât*' are: gṛihapakvahavishyânnais tailakshârâdivarjitaiḥ, (*juhuyât*, &c.); and those which should have preceded, and are absolutely required at the quotation '*avibhaktânâm*, &c.,' from Bhaṭṭoji, read: sa châyaṁ vaiśvadeva âtmasaṁskârârtho 'nnasaṁskârârthaś cha; tenâvibhaktânâṁ pâkaikye pṛithag vaiśvadevo na, vibhaktânâṁ tu pâkaikye 'pi havishyântareṇa pṛithag eva, (*avibhaktânâm*, &c.) For the translation of the whole passage, see p. 37, ll. 10 ff.

† Dharmas., ed. Bombay (1861), III. A., fol. 95 *b*, ll. 7 ff.

‡ The object of the Vaiśvadeva is similarly defined in a passage of Śâtâtapa quoted in Raghunandana's Âhnikatattva (ed. Calc. 1834, vol. i., p. 251); and the five Śûnâs are f[illegible] to, *e.g.* in Manu, III., 68, Śankarâchârya's comm. on [illegible] III., 13, and they are also defined in Ânandagiri's and Śrîdharasvâmin's gloss on the latter.

the Vaiśvadeva is early (*i. e.* in the morning), not like that of the Agnihotra, late (*i. e.* in the evening); accordingly the resolve to perform it, as expressed in the words: "early and late, the Vaiśvadeva (should be performed").* The five great sacraments are to be performed day by day; and these are the sacrament of the Veda, that of the gods, that of created beings, that of the manes, and that of men.† The sacrament of the Veda has been already explained.‡ Those who follow the ritual of the Ṛig-veda consider that the Vaiśvadeva consists of the three sacraments of the gods, created beings, and manes. The sacrament of men is the giving food to men. An oblation of food cooked in the house and fit for sacrificial purposes,§ free from sesamum-oil, factitious salt, and such like

---

* From *Raghunandana* (vol. i., p. 250) and similar works it results that the proper time for the performance of the V. is always during the day, and that the evening performance of this ceremony is permitted only under special conditions, as for instance when 'cooking' takes place for the entertainment of a guest. Some authorities, moreover, absolutely forbid the *repetition* of the ceremony on the same day, whether by day time or in the evening. But compare p. 39, l. 15.

† These five *mahâyajñas*, 'great sacrifices' or 'great sacraments,' are mentioned in the oldest works, *e. g.* in the Śatapatha-Brâhmaṇa (XI., 5, 6, 1)—also quoted from this Brâhmaṇa in Śrîdatta's Âchâradarśa—; in Manu, I., 112, &c., Yâjñavalkya, I., 102, &c.—*Manu* (III., 70) defines them as follows: "teaching (which, according to Kullûka, includes reading, viz. the Vedas) is the sacrament of the Veda; offering rice &c. or water is the sacrament of the manes; an oblation (of food) in fire is the sacrament of the gods; presentation of food (viz. throwing ghee or rice, or the like, in the open air) to created beings, is the sacrament of created beings; hospitality is the sacrament of men."

‡ Viz. in a preceding portion of the text, here not translated.

§ Substances, called *havishya*, or fit for sacrificial purposes, are frequently mentioned in ritual works, as in the Kâtyâyana Śrauta Sûtras (VII., 2, 2), or in works dealing with ritual matters, as in Manu, Yâjñavalkya, &c. The *Mitâkshará* in its comment on *Yâjñ.*, I., 239, names as such: rice of different varieties, barley, wheat, kidney-beans of two varieties (phaseolus mungo and phaseolus radiatus), wild grain (wild roots, or in general such food as forms the diet of an ascetic), a black potherb called *kâlaśâka, mahâśalka* [explained as a kind of fish; Wils.: a prawn or shrimp], cardamoms, ginger, black pepper, asafœtida, molasses, candied sugar, camphor, rock-salt, sea-salt, bread-fruit, cocoanut, the plants called *kadalî* and *badara*, the produce of a cow,—viz. milk, curds, butter, or other preparations made of her milk,—honey, flesh, &c. On the other hand, as substances unfit for sacrificial oblations the *Mitâksharâ* names: *kodrava* (paspalum kora), *masûra* (ervum hirsutum), chick-pea, *kulattha* (dolichos biflorus), pulâka, a legume called *nishpâva*, a kind of bean called *râjamâsha* (dolichos catjang), the white pumpkin gourd, two kinds of the egg-plant (*vârttâku* and *vṛihatî*), *upodikâ* (basella rubra), the

(unsacrificial substances), and dressed with ghee, one should make in the (sacred) domestic fire, or the ordinary fire; (for) the law ordains that such an oblation (should be made) in the fire with which a man cooks his food.* Since the Śrâddha occurring at fixed periods is performed by (performing) the sacrament of the manes included in the Vaiśvadeva ceremony, no entertainment of Brâhmans takes place (as it would) on behalf of the Śrâddha occurring at fixed periods. And since also the Śrâddha, (due) on the day of new-moon, is performed by (performing) it (viz. the sacrament of the manes), Bhaṭṭoji says, that those who are unable to perform the Śrâddha, due on the day of new-moon (regularly), should do so once (at least) in the course of a year. In the case of (impurity arising from) childbirth, the rule is that the five great sacraments are dropped. And this Vaiśvadeva is performed for the sake of one's own consecration and that of the food.† Therefore amongst members of a united family when they cook (their food) in common, a separate performance of the Vaiśvadeva (by each member) is not (allowed); but amongst members of a divided family, even when they cook (their food) in common, the Vaiśvadeva (must be performed) separately (by each of them) with some sort of substance fit for sacrificial purposes. According to Bhaṭṭoji, amongst members of a united family, when the cooking (of their food) does not take place in common, the Vaiśvadeva may be performed separately or not.‡ When no cooking (of food) takes place on the eleventh and

---

shoot of a bamboo, longpepper, orris root, *Śatapushpâ* (anethum sowa), saline earth, ordure, factitious salt, a buffalo's-chounri, her milk,—curds, —butter, or other produce of buffalo's milk; &c.—Compare also on the same subject Manu, III., vv. 266 ff., the Vishńu-Purâńa, Book III., ch. 16; the *Nirńayasindhu*, I., fol. 13; *Raghunandana*, vol. i., pp. 70, 142 and 250; *Śrîdatta's Âchâradarśa* (Benares, 1864), fol. 56 *a*; &c.

* The Âchâradarśa (fol. 56 *a*) which quotes a passage to the same effect from Angiras, regarding the sacred and ordinary fire, adds: "the sense of this passage is: a man who maintains a sacred fire should cook his food and make the oblation, in this (sacred) domestic fire; one who does not maintain such a fire, in the ordinary fire."

† See p. 35, ll. 31 ff.

‡ The words "*an oblation of food cooked in the house*, &c." (p. 37, ll. 10 ff.) till "*performed separately or not*," are the complete passage, represented in the Bombay Digest by the words "*rice mixed*" till "performed *separately (in each household) or not*" (see above, p. 35, l. 21–l. 27). The correctness of the last words "performed separately or not" might at first sight seem doubtful, since their value in Sanskrit is the compound *kŕitâkŕita*, and this word (according to Páń., II., 1, 60, not a Dvandva, but a Karmadhâraya) would literally mean 'done—not done,' *i. e.* 'imperfectly done,' or 'done as if not done,' *i. e.* 'done in vain.' That in the

similar days (of abstinence), the Vaiśvadeva should be performed with grain (esp. of rice), milk, curds, ghee, fruits, water, and the like substances. Let a man perform it with rice and so on, (throwing such substances) with his hand,—or with water, (throwing the latter) with his hollowed palms, into water; but let him at the performance of the Vaiśvadeva avoid *kodrava* (paspalum kora), chick-pea, the kidney-bean (phaseolus radiatus), *masûra* (ervum hirsutum), *kulattha* (dolichos biflorus), and all factitious salt called *kshâra* and *lavaña*. When a man lives abroad, the Vaiśvadeva should be performed at his house by the instrumentality of his son, priest, or other (proper substitute); and should there not be at his house such other (proper) agent he himself must perform it abroad. Those who conform to the ritual of the Ṛig- and Black-Yajur-vedas should perform it twice (a-day), according to the text which says: 'it should be performed by day and by night.' But if unable to do so, they may, at the same time, repeat it or perform (the day- and night Vaiśvadeva) together.* The usual practice of followers of these two Vedas is to cook their food and perform the Vaiśvadeva, in the ordinary fire."†

In the chapter treating of the religious duties of sons *whose father is alive*, the same work contains the following statement:‡

"Sons not separated from their father should not perform the Vaiśvadeva separately; for it is stated that 'one who lives upon the cooking of (*i. e.* the food cooked by) his brother, is (like) one who lives upon the cooking of (*i. e.* the food cooked by) his father.' Hence, if the father maintains a sacred fire, even when the cooking and the Vaiśvadeva are effected with the sacred fire, his unseparated sons, although they, too, maintain a sacred fire, should not perform the Vaiśvadeva separately. Those who think that, in the absence of cooking, a fire becomes an ordinary one, may cook merely in order to consecrate their fire. But by members of a divided family the Vaiśvadeva should be performed

---

quotation from Bhaṭṭoji, however, the word has not this sense, but the one given it in the translation of the Bombay Digest, and in that above, follows not only from the sense in which the word *kṛitâkṛita* is unmistakably used in other passages of the *Dharmasindhusâra* and *Nirṇayasindhu* (since its meaning there becomes clear from the interpretations following it), but also from the injunction of *Âśvalâyana*, which is analogous to that of *Bhaṭṭoji* (see p. 41, ll. 21 ff.).

* See note * of page 37.

† There follows a description of the manner in which the V. is performed by members of the Vaishṇava and other sects, of the rules relating to the *Naivedya* ceremony, and other detail which it is not requisite here to enter into.

‡ Bombay ed. (1861), III. B., fol. 3 *a*, ll. 8 ff.

separately (by each of them). And since (according to the followers of the Ṛigveda-ritual*) the Vaiśvadeva consists of the three daily sacraments, viz. those of the gods, created beings and manes, those (who entertain this doctrine regarding the Vaiśvadeva), even if their father is alive, will perform the (daily) sacrament of the manes, forming part of the five great (daily) sacraments. To the followers of the Black-Yajurveda, however, the five great (daily) sacraments are distinct from the Vaiśvadeva; they (consequently) perform the (daily) sacrament of the manes, if their father is alive, (only) when they are members of a divided family."

In the chapter treating of those entitled to perform the *Śrâddha*, the same work says :†

"The son of one's own body has the preferential duty (and right) to perform the annual and other Śrâddhas and the funeral ceremonies which take place immediately after death. If there are several such sons, the *eldest* has this duty (and right); on failure of him, or if he is not present, or if his right has lapsed through having become an outcast or similar (disqualifications), the eldest after him. The statement, however, (made elsewhere) that in the absence of the eldest the youngest has always this right, not the sons between them, is without authority. Hence, if sons live in a state of division, the *eldest*, after having received from the younger (brothers) the (necessary) property, should perform all the funeral rites up to that called Sapiṇḍana.‡ But the annual and other Śrâddhas each of them must perform separately. If, however, sons live in a state of union, even the annual and other Śrâddhas must be performed by one of them only. (Still) since what is done by one (member of a united family) accrues to the benefit of the rest, all the sons should keep such rules as the observance of chastity, the not touching another person's food,§ and similar ones. If sons do not live in the same place, whether they stay in different countries or in different houses, each of them should perform the annual and other Śrâddhas separately, even if they are members of an undivided family."‖

---

* See p. 37, ll. 7 ff.

† III. B., fol. 4 *a*, ll. 10 ff.

‡ That is, inclusive of the first sixteen Śrâddhas which end with the *Sapiṇḍana*, also called *Sapiṇḍîkaraṇa*.

§ *Yâjñavalkya*, III., 241, classes 'feeding on others' amongst the crimes, called *upapâtaka*, which are only a degree less than the *mahâpâtaka*, or most heinous offences. *Manu*, III., 104, foretells parasites that, after death, they will become the cattle of their hosts.

‖ The rest of this chapter regulates the rights of younger sons in the

In the important chapter on the Śrâddha itself, under the head of "*settled rules relating to members of a divided and an undivided family*," the same work, after a general reference to previous statements, has the following:*

"Of brothers and other members of a family, divided in property, all the (religious) duties are separate. But that the funeral ceremonies and the sixteen Śrâddhas up to the Sapiṇḍana (which are performed during the first year after a death) should be performed by one of them only, has been already stated.† Yet if members of a family are undivided, all such acts as may be done without (spending any) property, *e. g.* bathing, the Sandhyâ-devotion, the sacrament (*i. e.* reading) of the Vedas, muttering of prayers, fasting, reading the Purâṇas, are done (by each of them) separately; whether such acts recur at regular periods, or are occasional, or (purely) voluntary; separately, also, such ceremonies of regular recurrence, enjoined by vedic or traditional works, as are performed with fire. Another view founded on the teaching of Kâtyâyana and others is, that 'one who lives on the cooking of a brother is (like) one who lives on that of a father.' Of the five great (daily) sacraments those of the gods, created beings, manes, and men‡ should be performed by the *eldest* (brother) only. If the cooking is done separately (by members of a united family) those who conform to the rules of Âśvalâyana, say that the separate performance of the Vaiśvadeva (by each member of such a family) is optional.§ Since, if the eldest (brother) does not perform the Vaiśvadeva, it is (the duty) of a younger (brother) to perfect the cooking (of the food by means of this ceremony), some enjoin that before eating, some of the food should be thrown by him into the fire, and some given to a Brâhman. The worship of the (tutelary) gods may be performed (by each of them) separately, or (by all of them) conjointly. The annual Śrâddhas, those performed on the day of new-moon, at the sun's entrance into a new sign, eclipses, and similar Śrâddhas should be performed by the eldest only. The Śrâddhas, also, performed in holy places (*e. g.* of the Ganges) and those of the same category should be performed by one member only of an undivided family, if all the members happen to be together (in the place), but separately, (by each member) if they happen to be in different places. The same rule applies

absence of the eldest, and in their absence those of other members of a family successively to perform the Śrâddhas. Its importance regarding the rights of inheritance, requires no remark; but as these rights do not concern the present paper, no further extract on this point is here given.

* III. B., fol. 37 *b*, ll. 5 ff.

† See p. 40, ll. 20 ff.

‡ See p. 37, ll. 4 ff.

§ Compare p. 38, ll. 20 ff.

to the Śrâddha, which is performed at (the holy city of) Gayâ (in Behar). As regards sacrificial ceremonies, at which voluntary gifts are made, and which can be effected only by means of (spending some of the family) property, the right of performing them depends on the assent of the brothers and other (members of the united family). The Śrâddha on the 13th day of the dark fortnight of the month Bhâdra, which is under the asterism Maghâ, it is stated, should be performed separately by each member (of an undivided family)." *

The work from which these passages are taken, is a compilation from other works, among which it prominently names the *Nirṇayasindhu*, com-

* Compare for the Śrâddhas to be performed at holy places and the 13th of the dark fortnight of the month Bhâdra, also the following passages from Wilson's translation of the *Vishṇu-Purâṇa* (III., 14, vv. 17-19): "He who, after having offered food and libations to the Pitṛis, [manes] bathes in the Ganges, Satlaj, Vipâśâ (Beas), Sarasvatî, or the Gomatî at Naimisha, expiates all his sins. The Pitṛis also say: 'after having received satisfaction for a twelvemonth, we shall further derive gratification by libations offered, by our descendants, at some place of pilgrimage, at the end of the dark fortnight of Mâgha'"; and (*ibid.*, III., 16, vv. 17 ff): "In former times, O king of the earth, this song of the Pitṛis was heard by Ikshwâku, the son of Manu, in the groves of Kalâpa: 'Those of our descendants shall follow a righteous path, who shall reverently present us with cakes at Gayâ. May he be born in our race who shall give us, on the thirteenth of Bhâdrapada and Mâgha, milk, honey, and clarified butter." (Wilson's Works, vol. viii., pp. 170 and 197.) As pointed out by the editor, the phrase "for a twelvemonth" is in the Sanskrit text represented by *varshâmaghâ;* and the phrase "on the thirteenth of Bhâdrapada and Mâgha" by *trayodaśîm . . . . . varshâsu cha maghâsu cha.* But the former being rendered by Śrîratnagarbha: *aparapakshamaghâtrayodaśî*, and the latter: *varshâsu, bhâdrapade, maghânakshatre trayodaśîm*, it would be better to substitute for them: "on the 13th day of the dark fortnight of the month Bhâdra, which is under the asterism Maghâ."—The sanctity of this day and its appropriateness for the performance of the Śrâddha already result from Manu, III., 273 and 274, where the *same* expression—*trayodaśîm . . . . . varshâsu cha maghâsu cha'* occurs, and is interpreted by Kullûka to v. 273: *varshâkâle maghâtrayodaśyâm*, and to v. 274: *bhâdrakṛishṇatrayodaśî;* also from [illegible] 260: where the words *varshâtrayodaśyâm maghâsu* are explained in the same manner by Vijñâneśvara: *bhâdrapadakṛishṇatrayodaśyâm maghâyuktâyâm.*—Compare also Sir W. Jones, on the lunar year of the Hindus, As. Res., vol. iii., p. 292. Besides these verses, other quotations relating to the same subject, from *Śankha, Śâtâtapa*, and others, occur in Jîmût., III., 1, 18. in [illegible]'s Tithitattva (Calc. ed. 1834, vol. i., pp. 75, 160), in the [illegible] III., fol. 42 *a, b*), Dharmas. (II., fol. 31 *b*), &c., which also show that each member of a family, whether divided or undivided, must for himself perform this particular Śrâddha.

posed by *Kamalâkara*, in the year 1611, P. C.* As the latter is held in especial esteem by the Mahrattas for whose benefit, it seems, the Bombay Digest was chiefly intended, I will add a translation of its chapter: "*On the settled rules relating to members of a divided and undivided family*," which likewise forms part of its section on the Śrâddha.† It runs thus:

"The *Prithvîchandrodaya* quotes these words of *Marîchi*: 'If there are many sons of a father who live together, all that is done with the undivided (family-) property, by the eldest, the rest consenting, must be (considered as) done by all of them.' These words mean that, though the eldest is the agent, all of them share in the result (of his acts). Therefore such religious rules, as the observance of chastity, &c., must be kept by every one of them, since they consecrate the persons who obtain the result. And this applies also to re-united members of a family, on account of the analogy (that exists between them and members of a united family).‡

"The *Mitâksharâ* quotes these words of *Nârada*: 'The religious duty of unseparated brethren is single; when partition has been made, even the religious duties become separate for each of them.'§ *Vrihaspati* also says: 'Of members of a family who live (together and) cook (their food) in common, the sacraments of the manes, gods and twice-born should be single; of those who are divided, they should be performed in each house separately.' ‖ Though in this last text, no exception being mentioned, the prohibition of a separate performance (of religious acts) in an undivided family would also (seem to) obtain for such acts as the reading of the Vedas, the Sandhyâ devotion and the like, it (nevertheless) merely relates to the performance of the Śrâddha, Vaiśvadeva and other ceremonies

---

* This date is given by the author himself at the end of his work, in the words: vasu (= 8) ŕitu (= 6) ŕitu (= 6) bhû (1) *i. e.* 1668 of the era of Vikramâditya.

† Ed. Bombay (1857), III. B., fol. 65 *a*, ll. 4 ff.

‡ This passage also occurs in the same chapter, fol. 8 *b*, ll. 11 ff.

§ Mit., ch. ii., sec. xii., § 3.—The same quotation also occurs in the *Viramitrodaya*, Calc. ed., p. 169 *b*, 223 *a*; the *Vivâdachintâmaṇi* (ed. Calc. 1837), p. 162 (Colebrooke's translation of this passage in the Mit., and that of Tagore p. 311 in the Viv. materially differ from one another); in the *Smŕitichandrikâ* (Calc. 1870) p. 8, *Vyavahâramayûkha*, ch. iv., sec. vii., § 28 (Borradaile's translation being the same as Colebrooke's), and in other Digests.

‖ This quotation also occurs in the *Vivâdach.*, p. 125 (Tagore, p. 227); *Viramitrodaya*, f. 172 *a*, 222 *b*; *Kullûka* to *Manu*, IX., 111; *Dâyakaumudî* (Calc. 1827), p. 28; *Smŕitichandrikâ*, p. 8; &c.

which can be effected only by (spending some of the family) property; for such property having more than one owner, one (member of the family alone) would not be entitled to spend it. All such acts, however, as may be done without (spending any) property, *e. g.* muttering prayers, fasting, the Sandhyâ devotion, reading the Vedas and Purâṇas, whether such acts recur at regular periods, or are occasional, or (purely) voluntary, each member is competent to perform separately (for himself). For there being no expenditure of property, no consent (of the rest) is required; and consequently the words (before quoted) 'with the undivided (family-) property' cannot apply to such acts. And this conclusion also results from the following text of *Âśvalâyana* as quoted in the *Prayogapârijâta*: 'Amongst twice-born men who cook (their food) in common there should always be separate the sacrament (or reading) of the Vedas, the Agnihotra, the worship of the gods, and the Sandhyâ devotion.' (In this passage) Agnihotra signifies such ceremonies of regular recurrence, enjoined by vedic or traditional works, as are performed with fire. For (the right of each member of a family to fulfil) these duties (separately) is logically analogous to the right acquired by the consent of the rest. The Śrâddha of the father, and other acts of regular recurrence which have the same consequence (for all the members of a family) a single (member) is entitled to perform even without the consent of the rest; for it is said:* 'Even a single (member) of a family may conclude a donation, mortgage, or sale, of immovable property, during a season of distress, for the sake of the family, and especially for pious purposes.' 'For pious purposes,' means, according to Vijñâneśvara,† for the performance of indispensable duties, viz. the Śrâddha of the father, or the like.

"But some maintain that even of members of an undivided family, if they cook (their food) separately, and if they stay in different countries, each has to perform separately (for himself) the Śrâddhas on the day of new-moon and the annual Śrâddhas; for *Hârîta* has said: 'If undivided brethren cook their food separately, each of them should also perform separately the Vaiśvadeva and the other Śrâddhas'; and *Yama*: 'If a son who is not separated (from the family) stays in a foreign country, he should perform (for himself) separately the Śrâddha of the father on the anniversary of his death, and the Śrâddha on the day of new-moon.'

---

* By *Vṛihaspati*, according to the Ratnâkara (as quoted by Colebrooke) on the *Mit.*, ch. i., sec. i., § 28. Comp. also the *Vîram.*, f. 181 *a*; *Vivâdach.*, p. 161.

† Mit., ch. i., sec. i., § 29.

"If (the drift of) these texts is properly considered, their sense (will be found to be) this: Of the five great (daily) sacraments, the eldest should with the consent of the other (members) of the family perform the sacraments of the gods, created beings, manes and men; for also *Vyâsa* has said: 'Food should never be eaten without previously making a sacrificial offering, and presenting a first (portion) of it (to a Brâhman); amongst members of an undivided or re-united family what is done even by a single (member) *is* done (by all).' But if one's food has been prepared without the eldest (member) having performed the Vaiśvadeva, he may eat it after having silently thrown some of it into the fire. For, where treating of the rights of members of an undivided family the *Pṛithvîchandrodaya* quotes this passage from *Gobhila*: 'Whose food in the family is first ready, he may eat it after having put a certain portion of it into the fire, and given a first (portion) of it to a Brâhman.' Again, *Âśvalâyana* mentions the ceremonies which (members of a divided family) should perform separately when they cook their food separately; and also separately when they cook it in common; (his words are):* 'Of members even of a divided family, if they live (together and) cook (their food) in common, one, the master (of the household), should perform the four (daily) sacraments which (in the order of the five †) are preceded by the sacrament of speech. But men of the twice-born classes, whether members of an undivided or a divided family, if they cook (their food) separately, should, previous to taking it, each separately perform these sacraments day by day.' The sacrament of the Veda, the Sandhyâ devotion, bathing, the sacrament of the manes, and the like ceremonies are for the reason stated, performed separately (by each member); but on account of the two texts quoted, the worship of the gods either in common (by one) or separately (by each member); the Śrâddhas on the day of new moon, at eclipses, &c., by one member only; the Śrâddha at holy places, and similar Śrâddhas by one only, if all the members of the undivided family happen to be together (in the place), but separately (by each member), if they happen to be in different places. And so likewise the Śrâddha which is performed at Gayâ. For *Hemâdri* quotes this passage from the *Kûrma-Purâṇa*: 'Many well conducted and excellent sons must be wished for; (for) if one of their number goes to Gayâ, we are saved by him, and he enters upon the highest path.' ‡

---

* Compare the same passage in the subsequent extract from the Vyavahâramayûkha; p. 47, ll. 33 ff.

† See p. 37, ll. 4 ff.

‡ The first portion of this quotation ('many' till 'Gayâ') occurs

"As regards voluntary acts, such as sacrificial offerings connected with the making of gifts, and the like, the right of performing them depends on the assent of the other (members of the family); that of muttering prayers and performing similar acts which entail no expenditure of property exists without (such) assent. *Aparârka* quotes these words of *Paiṭhînasi*: 'The annual and similar Śrâddhas should be performed separately by each member of a divided family; but if performed by one member of an undivided family, it is as good as if they were performed by all of them.' That the monthly Śrâddhas, which precede the annual Śrâddha, must be performed conjointly (by the whole family), *Laghu-Harîta* has declared in these words: 'The sixteen Śrâddhas which end with the Sapiṇḍana, sons should not perform (each of them) separately; nor ever, even when divided in property.' The Sapiṇḍana here implies a monthly Śrâddha; for this results from the words of *Vyâsa*: 'After the year (following the death of the father) the eldest (son) should perform the Śrâddha before the assembled family; but after the Sapiṇḍana (has been accomplished) each son should perform it separately.' And *Uśanas* says: 'The 'new' *Śrâddha*,* the Sapiṇḍana, and the sixteen Śrâddhas should be performed by one member of the family only, even if the latter is divided in property; but the Śrâddha on the 13th day of the dark fortnight of Bhâdra, which is under the asterism Maghâ † should be performed separately by each member even of an undivided family'; as has been already mentioned.‡ But when *Vriddha-Vasishṭha* says, 'the monthly Śrâddha, the ceremony of setting a bull free, and the Sapiṇḍana should be performed by the eldest, as well as the first annual Śrâddha',—his injunction is without authority. In the Pariśishṭha of the Ṛigveda ritual (it is said that members of a family) should perform the 'new' Śrâddha conjointly."

With these extracts from the Dharmasindhusâra and its predecessor, the Nirṇayasindhu, it will now be expedient to compare the law on this matter as laid down by the principal authority of the Mahrattas, the *Vyavahâramayûkha*. It is contained in the following passage. §

---

with some variation in the Râmâyaṇa (ed. Bombay, 1861), II., 107, v. 13; and is quoted also by several treatises on adoption, the Dattakakaumudî, Dattakasiddhântamañjarî, &c.

[illegible] (navaśrâddha) is the collective name of the ceremonies which begin on the first day after a death, and end on the tenth (comp. Dharmas., III. B., fol. 7 *b*, l. 9).

† *Maghâtrayodaśî*; see note * of page 42.

‡ Viz. III. B., f. 8 *b*, and f. 9 *a*, where the same quotations from *Laghu-Harîta* and *Uśanas* occur.

§ Ch. iv., sec. vii., § 28–§ 33. Consistently with the opinion ex-

"*Nârada* says: * 'The religious duty of unseparated brethren is single; when partition has been made, even the religious duties become separate for each of them.' Here the term 'unseparated' is intended to denote the chief topic (treated of), whilst 'brethren,' on account of its (merely) qualifying the former, is not to be taken in its literal sense. Therefore in an unseparated family, even if it consists of a father, grandfather, son, son's son, paternal uncle, brother, brother's son or other (relatives), their religious duty is single.

"Here again, though conjointness of an act, in regard to its various stages, follows as a logical consequence if there is sameness of place, time, agency, and so on, an express text would cause such conjointness to cease, if the agency is not the same, though (it is) that of members of an undivided family. Hence all those religious duties, enjoined by vedic and traditional works, which are fulfilled by means of fire, even of unseparated (brethren) are separate for each (of them), since they are different according as different kinds of fire would be connected (with the ceremony). Even so the Śrâddha of a paternal uncle, brother's son, &c., at the day of new moon and other (seasons) is separate by reason of the separation of the deified person (from the *pârvaṇa* rite); but the Śrâddha of brothers (dying) without (maintenance of) a sacred fire is performed by one and the same act, because all the deified persons are conjoint. Again, by residence abroad and the like (causes), there being a difference in the places (where members of a family live, the Śrâddhas are to be performed) separately (by each member); the ceremonies also performed with fire are separate for those who maintain a sacred fire. But the worship of the household deities, the Vaiśvadeva and similar ceremonies are performed (conjointly) by one and the same act. Hence *Śâkala* says: 'Of those who live (together and) cook (their food) in common, there is but one worshipping of the deity in the house, and but one Vaiśvadeva; in a family of divided brethren these acts are performed in each house separately.'

"As for the text, however, of Âśvalâyana, as quoted in the Pârijâta, which says: 'Of members even of a divided family, if they live (together and) cook (their food) in common, one, the master (of the household), should perform the four (daily) sacraments, which (in the

---

pressed at p. 31, in the translation that follows, as much as possible has been retained of Borradaile's version; several portions of the latter, however, had necessarily to be altered, as not correctly rendering the sense of the original.

* See p. 43, ll. 17 ff.

order of the five) are preceded by the sacrament of speech; but men of the twice-born classes whether members of an undivided or a divided family, if they cook (their food) separately, should, previous to taking it, each separately perform these sacraments day by day';*—this text has reference to members of a re-united family; for that such is its import, follows from the words 'of members even of a divided family, if they live (together and) cook (their food) in common,' and from the words 'whether members of an undivided or a divided family.'

"Therefore if there be a separate cooking of food, as is sometimes the case, amongst members of a re-united family, their great (daily) sacraments are separate. 'Sacrament of speech' is 'the sacrament (*i. e.* the reading) of the Veda.' The phrase 'those (sacraments) which are preceded by the sacrament of speech' is represented (in Sanskrit) by (one word which is) a Bahuvrîhi (or possessive) compound of the class where the quality expressed by it (as the predicate of something else) is not intended for *the* (*i. e.* the essential) quality (of the latter); for were this compound meant to convey such an (essential) quality, the words 'preceded by the sacrament of speech' would yield no sense, since there would then be no cause for excluding the first (sacrament); whereas it logically follows that the four (sacraments only) are here meant.†

---

* See p. 45, ll. 17 ff.

† The grammatical observation in this passage, relating to Bahuvrîhi compounds, is an allusion to a *paribhâshâ* or interpretation-rule which occurs in *Patañjali's Mahâbhâshya* on *Pâṅini*, I., 1, 27 (viz. the par. *bahuvrîhau tadguṅasaṁvijnânam api*; on which Nâgojîbhaṭṭa in the *Paribhâshenduśekhara* observes that, on account of the word *api*, it also implies *atadguṅasaṁvijnânam*). The drift of this *paribhâshâ*, as Patañjali explains it, is to show that Bahuvrîhi compounds (in English comparable to adjective compounds like lightfoot—*i. e.* one who possesses light feet,—or blueeye-d, &c.) are of two kinds, the one expressing a quality or an attribute which is essential, and the other expressing a quality or an attribute which is not essential, to the subject so predicated by the compound. Thus, as Patañjali illustrates, if you say: 'there march the priests having red turbans on,' the Bahuvrîhi *lohitoshṇîshâḥ* 'having red turbans on' implies here an essential quality of the priests, since this quality cannot be disconnected from their appearance as they march. But if you say: 'bring hither the man who possesses brindled cows (*chitragu*),' you want the man to be brought, but not his cows; hence the quality of 'possessing brindled cows' would in this case be disconnected from the appearance of the man, and therefore would not be essential to it. In the first instance the quality expressed by the compound was the characteristic feature, in the second it is merely the descriptive mark, of the subject predicated by it; and this, as *Nâgojî* in his commentary observes, depends on the sense. The application, then, regarding the compound

Hence the sacrament of the Veda should be performed separately (by each member of the family). But (after all) these two texts are not much respected by the learned.

"As regards, however, the following sentences in the *Dharmapravṛitti*:

'Sons unseparated must (conjointly) celebrate one anniversary Śrâddha for both parents; if they be in different countries they must (each of them) separately perform the Śrâddha on the day of new moon and the monthly Śrâddhas. If they go to (reside in) different villages, unseparated brethren should always (each of them) separately perform the Śrâddha on the day of new moon and the monthly Śrâddhas of both parents. When unseparated, but residing in different villages, each living upon the wealth acquired by himself, these brothers should celebrate the Pârvaṇa-Śrâddha separately;'

"And as regards the following passage in the *Smṛitisamuchchaya*:

'The Vaiśvadeva, the anniversary Śrâddha, as well as the Mahâlaya rite, in case the members of a family reside in different countries, are to be celebrated separately (by each of them), and in like manner the Śrâddha on the day of new moon,' —

"These (two) texts, some say, have reference to members of a re-united family residing in different countries. But the fact is that they have no authority.

"Or, to sum up: if there be sameness of place, time, agency and so on, conjointness (in the performance of the act) follows as a matter of logical reasoning. If the agency is not the same, such conjointness (only exists if it) is established by an express text. If the place is not the same, some base (the rule concerning) the separate performance of Śrâddhas and other ceremonies on circumstantial reasoning, since in such a case there is neither a logical necessity nor an express text (which would establish conjointness)."

Even from these few extracts it will be seen that commensality or the reverse of it has not been regarded as a proof of either union or division of a family; for without any restriction whatever, as we find,

---

vâgyajñapûrvaka, 'preceded by the sacrament of speech,' which our text makes of this paribhâshâ is: that if this predicate of the 'four sacraments' spoken of had been considered by the writer as *essential* to them, the four sacraments would have been represented by him as accompanied and headed by 'the sacrament of speech'—which would be nonsense. If, however, this predicate was understood by him as being merely a descriptive one, the sense would be, as it should be, that the four sacraments are those which in their usual order come after the sacrament of speech, but are not accompanied by it.

members of a *united* family are spoken of as residing and 'cooking' apart from one another, and members of a *divided* family as living and messing together.

And I may add at once that I know of no Hindu law-authority which *distinctly* declares that 'living or dining apart' is a legal *test* of partition. *Manu*, *Vyâsa*, and other lawgivers, it is true, sometimes say that sons and parents should 'live together,' but in the first place, the words they use to this effect, do not imply an obligation; they merely convey a recommendation or permission; and secondly, their expression 'living together' does not intimate a particular mode of life which would be a *test* of union, but is used synonymously with 'union' in general.

Hence, when *Manu* says:* "Either let them thus live together, or let them live apart (*Kullûka : i. e.* let them separate), if they have a desire of performing religious duties, &c."—his words merely express the lawfulness of both union and separation, but not a criterion of either. Or, when *Vyâsa* writes, "It is lawful that brothers and their parents, if the latter are alive, should live together," the *Smṛitichandrikâ*, after quoting these words, adds: "even after the demise of the father brothers live together for the sake of increasing mutually their property; for *Śankha* and *Likhita* have said 'Let them willingly live together, for being in harmony and united they will become prosperous.' "† Here again, therefore, 'living together' does not imply a particular mode of domestic life, without which union could not exist, but simply a state of union in general as contrasted with a state of separation in general. And consequently, passages of this kind are not alleged by the Digests under the head of "*evidence of partition*," but in the chapter treating of the *periods* of partition;—a distinction, which, from a Hindu point of view, is very material.

There is indeed one text which might seem to imply that "*cooking apart*" (not living apart) *was* considered by a native authority as a sign of partition, viz. a passage in Nârada's Dharmaśâstra,‡ for it occurs there under the head of "ascertainment of a contested partition," and being quoted in Jîmûtavâhana's Dâyabhâga under the same head, has been translated by Colebrooke thus:

"Gift and acceptance of gift, cattle, grain, house, land and attendants

---

* IX., 111; in the Vyavahâra-Mâdhavîya quoted as a verse of *Prajâpati*. Compare also Jîmûtav. Dâyabh., I., § 37.

† Ed. Calc., p. 8.

‡ J. O. MS. No. 1300, fol. 38, *b*: dânagrahaṅapaśvannagṛihakshetraparigrahâḥ, vibhaktânâṁ pṛithag jñeyâḥ pâkadharmâgamavyayâḥ.

must be considered as distinct among separated brethren, as also *diet*, religious duties, income and expenditure."*

But in consulting the explanation given by the best commentators of this passage, and in comparing it with the sense put upon it in other Digests, it will be found that instead of "as also diet, religious duties, income and expenditure," the translation should most probably run: "as also *the religious duties connected with the cooking* (of food), income and expenditure"—when the very omission of 'cooking apart' in this passage would strongly confirm the opinion just expressed.†

---

* XIV., § 7.—The italics of *diet* are mine.—In Colebrooke's Digest of Hindu Law, vol. iii., p. 407 and p. 417, this passage is translated thus: "When co-heirs have made a partition (distribution) the acts of giving and receiving cattle, grain, houses, land, household establishments, dressing victuals, religious duties, income and expenses are to be considered as separate, and (conversely) as proofs of a partition;" whereupon Jagannâtha observes (p. 407): "'dressing victuals' [here means] for the service of guests and the like, and for the food of the family; 'religious duties'; the aggregate of constant and occasional acts of religion." It will be seen however from the next note that his interpretation of *pâkadharma* is not borne out by the principal commentators of Jîm. Dâyabh. and the other Digests.

† On the first part of the compound *pâkadharmâgamavyayâḥ*, Achyutânanda, in Bharatachandraśiromaṇi's edition of Jîmûtav. Dâyabh. (p. 357) comments: *pâkadharmâ vaiśvadevadharmâdayaḥ*, when pâkadharma, therefore, would not be a Dvandva, but a Tatpurusha compound; and similarly *Śrîkṛishṇat.*: (as also in the previous Calc. editions) *pâkadharmo vaiśvadevâdikarma*, i. e. "religious duties connected with cooking, that is, the Vaiśvadeva duties (or ceremonies), and similar ones"; *Râmabhadra* in the edition named merely comments on *dharma* (not on *pâkadharma*), viz. *dharmo daivapitrâdikarma;* but as *daiva* is frequently used synonymously with *vaiśvadeva*, the meaning of his words would be: "the Vaiśvadeva, the sacrament of the manes, and similar ceremonies"; when it becomes probable that the proper reading should be *pâkadharmo daiva°*, or that *dharma* is abbreviated by the commentator for *pâkadharma;* in the *Vîramitrodaya* also (p. 223 *a*, l. 12) where the same passage of Nârada is quoted, *Mitramiśra* explains (l. 14) *dharmo vaiśvadevâdiḥ, ekapâkena vasatâm iti prâguktavachanât*, i. e. "religious duty means the Vaiśvadeva and so on, on account of the previous quotation (from Nârada) which says: 'of those who live (together and) cook (in common) (the worship of the manes, gods and twice-born should be single, &c.)'"; where *dharma* is therefore used in the sense of *pâkadharma*, and the 'sign' in question is not the 'cooking,' but the religious rites connected with the cooking.—Again in the *Vivâdachintâmaṇi*, where the same passage occurs (p. 162) *Vâchaspatimiśra* likewise takes pâkadharma for a Tatpurusha; viz. *pâkadharmaḥ pârvaṇâdiḥ*, "the religious duties connected with cooking, i. e. the Pârvaṇa and other ceremonies." In the

It is to be presumed that on the strength of this passage,—as translated by Colebrooke,—Strange, Macnaghten, and other modern authors, even though rejecting non-commensality as a 'sign' of separation, allowed it a place amongst the different kinds of 'evidence of partition;'* but with the aid of the printed texts and commentaries we now possess, there can be no doubt that we should not be justified in stating for certain, as the Bombay Digest does, that *according to Hindu authors*, living and dining apart is a *sign* of separation.†

But though the extracts already adduced merely confirm the negative inference derivable from the ancient law authorities, that commensality, taken by itself, affords no legal evidence regarding the state of a family, they show us that a different view must be entertained of the value which some ceremonies at least possess for testing doubtful cases of this kind.

Some religious acts, as we see, must, according to all authorities, be performed separately by each member of a family, and others in

---

Dâyakaumudî, too, (p. 278) *Śrîkrishṇat.'s* commentary on this passage, as already mentioned, is quoted and adopted by Râmajayatarkâlaṁkâra. On the other hand in the *Vyavahâramâdhavîya* and *V*[illegible] (IV., 7, § 34), instead of *pâkadharmâgama°*, the text [illegible], when *Nîlakaṇ'ha* explains *dânadharmo lekhyâdiḥ*, "the duties connected with *gifts*, i. e. written deeds, and the like."—The word *grain* which occurs in Colebrooke's translation represents the Sanskrit *anna;* and lest any inference be drawn from it regarding 'diet,' or lest it be doubted that this is the proper sense of the word as here used, I may mention that the *Dâyakaumudî*, on the authority of the *Vivâdabhangârṇava*, says: "*anna* here means 'the getting of grain,'" and adds: "but some say *anna* here means 'buying corn, grain, &c., for the sake of food (*annârtham*).'" But even for *anna*, the Vivâdach. has the v. l. *artha* and explains it with *arthotpâdana* 'producing wealth.'—Whatever view therefore we may take of this passage it is clear that the balance of [illegible] in favour of Śrîkrishṇatarkâlaṁkâra's, Achyutânanda's, [illegible] gloss, and that *Nârada*, if he really wrote *pâkadharma°* and not *dânadharma*, did not make 'cooking,' but the religious duties connected with it, 'a sign of partition.'

* Macnaghten, for instance, in his 'Principles of Hindu Law' (Madras, 1865), p. 53, says: "It (viz. partition) cannot always be inferred from the manner in which the brethren live, as they may reside apparently in a state of union, and yet, in matters of property, each may be separate; while, on the other hand, they may reside apart, and yet may be in a state of union with respect to property: though it undoubtedly is one among the presumptive proofs to which recourse may be had, in a case of uncertainty, to determine whether a family be united or separate in regard to acquisitions and property."—Similarly, 'Strange, Hindu Law,' vol. i., p. 229.

† See p. 33, ll. 5, 6.

common, whether the members of such a family live in a state of union or separation. Thus, the reading of the Vedas, muttering prayers, and in general all religious acts which entail no expenditure, must be performed separately by each member even of a united family; on the other hand, the sixteen Śrâddhas which occur during the first year after a father's death, must be performed in common,—that is, as a rule, by the eldest son on behalf of the whole family—even if the latter is a divided one. Hence the performance of acts or ceremonies like these is no criterion either way, whether of union or separation. Yet we find that if members of a united family 'cook' their food in common, they are bound to perform, conjointly, the four daily sacraments of the gods, manes, created beings and men, the anniversary Śrâddha, the Śrâddha on the day of new moon, and the Śrâddhas of this category, the Tîrtha-, Gayâ-, and Śrâddhas of this nature, whilst, if messing apart or if separated, they would be bound to perform these rites separately, each for himself. The *Vaiśvadeva* also, members of a separated family *must*, and members of a united family, if not messing together, *may*, perform separately; but members of a united family, if messing together, *must* perform it conjointly. Hence, if it can be shown that relatives *mess together*, and yet perform all or any of these ceremonies *separately*, each for himself, it is clear that, on the ground of all authoritative texts, a case of division is made out.

Again, it is expressly enjoined that a voluntary religious ceremony entailing expenditure can be performed by a single member of a united family only on the condition that the rest of the family allow him to do so; and to this clause no restriction is attached regarding commensality or living apart. Hence if it can be shown that a person performed such a ceremony without any protest on the part of his relatives, yet without having obtained their consent, such evidence would prove that he was divided from them; or, conversely, if it can be shown that he asked and obtained the consent of his family to perform such a ceremony, proof is afforded that at that time he was a member of a united family.*

Some statements, therefore, of Sir T. Strange, on this subject are liable to objection. For, though he was right in dividing the religious

* How great the amount of evidence available on this purely religious ground is, can be fully ascertained only from the ritual works; but an inference to this end may be obtained from Colebrooke's Essays 'On the Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus,' and particularly from that relating to the Śrâddha (Miscellaneous Essays, vol. i., pp. 123 ff.); also from H. H. Wilson's 'Religious Practices and Opinions of the Hindus' (Works, vol. ii., pp. 40 ff.; edited by Dr. R. Rost).

27015

duties of a Hindu into such as are "indispensable," and others which "in their nature are voluntary,"* he was mistaken in assigning to the latter class "consecrations, the stated oblations at noon or evening with whatever else there may be of a similar kind, the performance or non-performance of which respects the individual merely." And he was likewise mistaken when he said that "the proof in question [viz. of partition] results from the separate solemnization of such [rites], the acquittal or neglect of which is attended with consequences beneficial, or otherwise, to the individual, in his capacity as housekeeper (gṛihastha), or master of a family, the third and most important order among the Hindoos; of this kind are among others, the five great sacraments, in favour of "the divine sages, the manes, the gods, the spirits, and guests."† For we have seen that each member even of a united family must for himself perform several such ceremonies if the members of that family 'cook' apart from one another. And when he added, "Still such separate performance is not conclusive; it is a circumstance merely,"—we must point to the cases above mentioned, in which it *is* conclusive, provided the members of a family mess together. Again, exception must also be taken to the remark which the same learned author appended to a Paṅḍit's answer touching the same question.‡ "Had the division been doubtful," he said, "then certainly the joint performance of the ceremonies would be a conclusion against it; a conclusion merely, however; or, as it has been appositely called in another case, 'a token' (*adyuḥarana*, I suppose, in the original) not a proof." For, one of the ceremonies here alluded to is "the annual ceremony for a father," and the joint performance of such a ceremony, as we have seen, can only take place in a united family. The usual words for 'token,' moreover, from which he inferred that it implies a conclusion only, are in Sanskrit *chihna* and *lakshaṅa*, and each is often used in the sense of "characteristic or essential mark," when it is tantamount to proof.

The Editors of the Digest, however, not merely repeat, as we have seen, the general, and on account of its generality, objectionable statement of Strange, but after the words above quoted§ add: "In the pre-

* Hindu Law (1830), vol. i., pp. 227 ff.

† Those explained in note † of p. 37 are here meant.

‡ Hindu Law, vol. ii., p. 392.

§ P. xiv. "The separate performance of the Vaiśvadeva sacrifice, of Śrâddhas and other religious rites, is still less conclusive. At Dig. chapter iv., Q. 4, infra, a passage of Bhaṭṭojîdîkshita is quoted, according to which coparceners, living apart, may or may not perform the Vaiśvadeva each for himself, and, in the present condition of Hindu society, &c." See p. 34, ll. 12 ff.

sent condition of Hindu society, the performance of all religious rites has become so lax and irregular as to afford no safe ground for inference." I do not know on what authority this sweeping assertion is made, for the Editors do not at all indicate the source whence it has been derived. Hitherto the most reliable accounts of the present religious condition of India seem to lead to the conclusion, supported also by the writings of Colebrooke, Wilson, Haug, and others, that there is still in the country a very large proportion of the community which very tenaciously clings to what it considers its orthodox faith, and that this community is extremely jealous of allowing any European to pry into its devotions and to become acquainted with the detail of them. Nor is it clear what the Editors call 'lax and irregular;' for, compared to the vedic ritual, for instance, that taught by the Purâńas may be so qualified, and judged by the standard of the latter, doubtless more recent ceremonies may likewise be thus termed. A statement so vague and general is in reality therefore meaningless, for it neither specifies the ceremonies to which it relates, nor the period or the standard by which to obtain a medium of comparison between the present and past. Yet even if the Editors had afforded us the information required, and if their statement concerning the quality of the actual worship of the Hindus were in some sense correct, it still appears that their conclusion would not be borne out by it. For in so far as the Hindu law of inheritance appeals to evidence based on religious grounds, it is quite immaterial whether the detail in the performance of this or any other ceremony concerned by it, agrees with the teaching of the ancient or mediæval, or even modern ritual—provided such a performance is held, rightly or wrongly, to be in the spirit of the orthodox faith. Whether, therefore, the Śrâddhas or the Vaiśvadeva, for instance, are now performed in strict accordance with the ritual relied upon by Colebrooke in his 'Essay on the Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus,' or not, is for *legal* purposes absolutely irrelevant, so long as the popular mind still believes that the Śrâddha benefits the soul of a deceased relative, or that the Vaiśvadeva removes the sins which a man may have committed in preparing his daily meals. And that this belief no longer exists, the Editors would still have to prove. It is certain, moreover, that the Law Courts of the Bombay Presidency and the Paṅḍits can entertain no doubts in this respect, for otherwise it would be unintelligible why in suits relating to inheritance, the judges should address questions to the Paṅḍits about the performance of Śrâddha and other rites, and that the Paṅḍits should strengthen their replies by a reference to their doctrinal works; and even the Bombay Digest reports three instances, at least, of

such interrogatories, at pp. 48, 57, and 58. It would be a mistake, therefore, on the part of an Indian judge were he to adopt the inference suggested to him by the Bombay Digest that no performance of any religious ceremony whatever can afford conclusive evidence regarding the union or division of a Hindu family, and in consequence, that henceforth he may dispense with a study of the native authoritative works concerned in this matter. Even the few data here collected, by way of illustration, will sufficiently show that in doubtful cases these works will still be his safest guide.

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI stated that Mr. J. D. Bell had expressed his regret at not being able to be present; and Mr. Grady, reader of Hindu law at the Inns of Court, had also expressed his regret at being obliged to be elsewhere on urgent business, though he had intended to attend, and written to the effect that there was much of Hindu legal literature to be explored. It [illegible] incumbent upon the Indian Government to employ some competent [illegible] assisted by learned natives, to translate all such books as related to [illegible].

Mr. PRICHARD.—I can fully endorse all that Dr. Goldstücker has said as to the exceeding haziness that hangs about the translations of the Hindu law authorities that are at our disposal, and the unsatisfactory position which they occupy as text-books of Hindu law. In cases that arise the only resource that practitioners can have is to confine themselves to the precedents of the Privy Council reports; and when once it is necessary to leave that groove and to search for authority on some point upon which those precedents are silent, we become lost in what one can only describe as a maze. It would be most desirable, if it could be done, that a complete revision should be made of the whole of the books which we have now, or rather fragments of books. We cannot depend on the translations which we have of those books. We find sometimes that the precedents of Hindu law which we have been in the habit of looking on as settled Hindu law are altogether erroneous, and leading us astray. As regards the revision of the Hindu law books, I am quite sure if the matter was forcibly brought forward no objection could be made to it in high quarters. The only objection which could be made to it would be this, the Privy Council or the Law Commissioners might say, "It is unadvisable to translate these Hindu law books, because we have been going on now for so many years developing a code of Hindu law by these precedents and these principles which have been laid down by the decisions of the Privy Council, that it would be exceedingly unwise now to run the risk of disturbing the whole by producing what would be a correct code of Hindu law, but which might, nevertheless, be at variance with some of our precedents." No doubt that is a difficulty; and if the Hindu law books were properly translated, by which the principles of the Hindu law could be plainly laid down, we should find that many of our old precedents had been leading us astray in many important particulars. However, to any objection which might be raised to the revision of the Hindu law, we might make this answer, We have come ourselves very recently to the determination that it is advisable to revise the text of our own Scriptures; and, I think, after that there can be no valid objection to revising the Hindu law. It should be done by some recognized committee in whom the public would have confidence, so that their work, when complete, would be taken and accepted as a standard work of reference upon Hindu law.

General JACOB, after referring to Steele's compilation of Hindu Law as applicable to the west of India, observed that there were [illegible] to any very great alteration of the precedents laid down by the [illegible] the Privy Council in cases in which there were differences of opinion amongst the ancient Hindu authorities, in which cases the Privy Council had generally taken a common-sense view, or an English view, as to what was right.

Dr. GOLDSTÜCKER explained that what he proposed should be done did not extend to giving an opinion in cases where there was a possibility of interpreting the same

law book in different ways, but only related to supplying the Law Courts with a sufficient amount of correct and trustworthy translations of Sanskrit law texts.

General JACOB considered that it would be a most delicate thing to interfere with any precedent which coincided with our modern ideas of right, though it might not be found to be in accordance with the old Hindu law when properly translated. We ought to study the feelings and the ideas of the natives as to how far they would like to be governed by old usages and notions to be derived from the old Hindu law books, and we ought to inquire whether they have not become so far obliterated by time as to be no longer binding on the consciences of the Hindu people. We ought to show the Indian nation that we are anxious to govern them according to their own feelings and their own laws. At the same time it was our duty where their laws were outrageous, as some of them were, to endeavour to modify them. When the British Government induced the Rao of Kutch, who has always been most desirous to please us and to be most faithful to us, to abolish suttee, he fasted forty days and nights, because he was giving up what he considered a sacred duty. We had interfered in the case of suttee, though sanctioned by Hindu law and honoured by the people. The code of Manu indeed ignored this cruel rite, to which I appealed as other strengthening reasons for its abrogation that I was pressing on the consideration of his Highness. I trust, then, wherever any part of the Hindu law conflicted with natural right and justice and humanity, and it had become obsolete, we should be careful not to reinstate it. It was very much to be lamented that we had in some cases, as regards the law of adoption, for instance, lost sight of the first principle of government, *viz.* to govern a people according to their usages, and not to ride roughshod over their most sacred feelings. We might just as well have interfered with the law of marriage as with the law of adoption.

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI suggested that the Council be requested to bring this matter to the attention of the Duke of Argyll when the deputation went to him on the subject of the delay of justice in the Privy Council.

CHAIRMAN.—It appears to me that Dr. Goldstücker has convinced us of three things: first, that many translations of the Hindu law books are incorrect; secondly, that the judges who abide by those translations know nothing of Sanskrit; and third, that they ought to know something of Sanskrit. With regard to a revision of the translations, it [illegible] that there would be any real difficulty if the alterations and [illegible] upon that revision were found not to tally exactly with the curriculum of the judgments of the Privy Council. If we have been going wrong so long, the best thing we can do is to go right hereafter; and it appears to me that we ought to take some action in this matter, with a view to remedying the great abuses which have been brought before us. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of some of those gross blunders which have been committed by the highest courts of the country, owing to the ignorance of the real text of Hindu law. It has been a reproach to our Administration for many years that we have had judges administering a law they know nothing about. This is a state of things which, if once considered fairly by the authorities, cannot, I am sure, be allowed to continue. The Duke of Argyll has expressed his willingness to receive a deputation from the Association regarding the reconstruction of the Privy Council; that is to say, the organization of a court that would be able more speedily to dispose of the cases coming before it. In a few days the Privy Council will sit, with a list of no less than sixty-three cases from different colonies before it, of which number they will not be able to decide one quarter. If things go on as at present the arrears will accumulate to an extent painful to contemplate. When we go before the Duke of Argyll and press that matter upon his attention, we might also put before him the views of this Association on this matter, *viz.* that it is highly expedient that some immediate practical steps should be taken with a view to avail ourselves of the services of critical Sanskrit scholars in obtaining a more accurate translation of the Hindu law texts. The feeling of the meeting being apparently in accordance with that suggestion, it might be discussed in the Council and put into a practical shape. I am quite sure we all of us appreciate the extreme importance of that happy accident which has brought Dr. Goldstücker's learning and erudition to enlighten us upon the subject, and point out to us the causes which have rendered it possible for our highest courts to go wrong in cases involving important private and public interests.

General JACOB proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Goldstücker for his paper, and suggested the advisability of having the opinions of the native press upon the question,

and to deal with the subject in a careful manner; which motion, having been seconded by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI, was passed accordingly.

On the motion of Mr. DEVAN KAZI SHAHABUDIN, seconded by Dr. GOLDSTÜCKER, a vote of thanks was passed to the Chairman.

BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

A MEETING of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association was held at the Framjee Cowasjee Institute on Wednesday, the 27th of April, 1870, at six o'clock, P.M. On the motion of Mr. B. M. WAGLE, seconded by Mr. BUDROODEEN TYABJEE, Mr. DHUNJEEBHOY FRAMJEE PATELL was called to the Chair.

The minutes of last meeting were then read and confirmed. The correspondence between the Secretary of State for India and the Council of the East India Association on the subject of the Victoria Scholarships was next laid before the meeting, after which the Chairman called upon Mr. Pherozshah M. Mehta to read his Paper "On Clause 6 of the East India (Laws and Regulations) Bill."

Mr. MEHTA read the following paper:—

*On the East India (Laws and Regulations) Bill, Clause 6.**

I propose in this paper to discuss the bearing and utility of Clause 6 of the East India (Laws and Regulations) Bill, now before the British Legislature. To divest the discussion of what is generally deprecated as a purely speculative or theoretical character, I propose to prosecute this discussion in comparison or contrast with another scheme for the accomplishment of the same end as that enunciated by Clause 6:—*viz.* "The expediency of giving additional facilities for the employment of natives of India in the Civil Service of Her Majesty in India." The origin of this scheme which I propose to make use of in this manner is by no means of recent date. Traces of it a[illegible] the great parliamentary contests of 1813, 1833, and 1853, on the [illegible] Bills of those years. The scheme, however, in its modern form, is simply this:—To allow a certain number of Civil Service appointments to be competed for in India itself, say in its great Presidency towns, and to require the selected candidates to complete their education by a sojourn of about two yea[illegible] same two years which under the existing rules of the service are [illegible] candidates in the same manner.

[illegible] considerable hesitation that I undertake such a comparative criticism of Clause 6. The clause combines in its [illegible] of some of the greatest Indian statesmen at home. Framed and [illegible] servative Secretary of State for India, Sir Stafford Northcote, it was taken up last year by a Liberal Indian Minister, the Duke of Argyll, with the hearty and unqualified approbation of another Conservative statesman, [illegible] both Sir Stafford Northcote and the Duke of Argyll in the India [illegible] of Salisbury, better known to us as Lord Cranborne—and is perhaps at this moment being carried through the House of Commons by an Under Secretary of great promise and rising reputation, Mr. Grant Duff. To say that the framers and patrons of this measure are no less actuated by the noblest dictates of justice and humanity than distinguished for their high attainments and statesmen[illegible] to repeat what is already perfectly familiar to you all. N[illegible] gra[illegible] therefore warrant the [illegible] sure [illegible]

No slight defects or minor drawbacks should be allowed to militate against its favourable, even cordial reception. No mere difference of degree in the respective values of the two schemes proposed to be compared should be allowed much consideration. No such difference should be allowed to abate one jot of our gratitude for its positive value. But, after the most careful and anxious deliberation, I have been obliged to come to the opinion that Clause 6 of the Bill, if passed into law, is calculated to attain its object only at the risk of causing a fearful amount of mischief, which cannot easily be exaggerated. In itself, it embodies a measure of such a

* See Act itself in the Appendix, p. 67.

pernicious tendency that its rejection would be still beneficial in any event, though that rejection may involve the postponement of any settlement of the question for an indefinite period. It threatens to undo the most valuable results of the legislation of 1853 and 1858; it threatens to produce disorder and confusion in a department of the Indian Government, on which in a great measure depend the proper administration, well-being, and progress of India; it threatens to sow fruitful seeds of discord between races among whom they are already by far too abundant. It is because I am firmly convinced that such disastrous consequences would inevitably result from the passing of this clause, that I feel constrained to undertake the ungracious task of criticising it.

The fundamental objections to this measure may be summed up under a few principal heads. They are,—1st, that it strikes a fatal blow at the principle of competition in the Civil Service of India; 2nd, that it revives and encourages the promotion of political jobbery; 3rd, that it destroys the unity and esprit-de-corps of the service; 4th, that it is unjust and demoralizing for the natives themselves.

1. In urging the first objection to this measure I am not unaware that it is not uncommon even at the present day to question and condemn the fitness and policy of the principle of competition with regard to the Civil Service of India. I am not unaware that there are people with whom the objection, so far from being a positive recommendation in favour of the measure. I am not [illegible] view taken by the Duke of Argyll. In moving the second reading of a Bill containing a similar clause in the House of Lords last year, the Duke of Argyll expounded with his usual force and clearness the view he took of the matter. His Lordship spoke as follows:—"The [illegible] r Lordships are aware, was deprived of its commerce by the Acts of [illegible] when the succeeding twenty years had expired, and the Government of Lord Aderdeen had to consider what was called the renewal of the Charter, it was also considered whether it would not be expedient to assume at once in name as well as in reality the Government of India as the Government of the Crown. I well remember the discussions at that time; and I venture to say the main difficulty in our way was this: we did not know how to get rid of the patronage of the Company after it should have been removed from the Directors. It was found that to open it to fair competition was the only expedient. There was indeed no alternative, for Parliament—with perhaps almost too much jealousy, through the ancient echoes still ringing on the ears of men on that [illegible] would not have tolerated the exercise of that patronage directly by the [illegible] not by the Crown, by whom could it be exercised? It was therefore thrown open to competition. What may be the feelings of individual members of your Lordships' House I do not know, but I confess I have never been such a fanatic in support of competitive examination as to believe that that is the sole or in all cases the best method of getting the best men for the public service. But it is an escape from many difficulties, and when you have only a choice of difficulties, competitive examination gives on the whole a much better chance of success than the pure nepotism of the ancient Court of Directors; but the exercise of patronage when it is wholly removed from the danger of political jobbery or family nepotism is perhaps the very best mode of selecting men for the public service." In carefully examining this statement it is not difficult to discover that it is founded mainly upon two arguments. The first is a negative argument, *viz.* that it is not inherent in the very nature of patronage to degenerate in the long run into political jobbery. The second is the statement of an historical fact, *viz.* that the Act of 1853 did not introduce the principle of competition, as in itself a better system than that of patronage, but as permitting the only escape out of the constitutional danger of vesting the patronage of the service in the Crown. Now it must be confessed that the Duke is not far wrong in his historical statement. Anyone who reads the warm debates on the India Bill of 1853 cannot fail to perceive that most of the speakers who advocated the principle of competition were actuated in so doing more by the motive described by the Duke than by any appreciation of its superiority over the system of patronage. It must not be thought, however, that among the framers and advocates of the Bill there were none who fully understood the entire scope and bearing of the new principle it introduced. There were two members, two of the greatest thinkers and statesmen that England has ever produced, who not only grasped the problem in all its length and breadth, but also expounded it with a force and eloquence but rarely surpassed. It will not be amiss to call your attention to their arguments, at a time when the principle of competition is not only directly

assailed by its adversaries, but its positive value is but faintly understood or realized by its advocates. I will therefore make no apology for the lengthy extracts with which I am going to trouble you. Mr. Lowe, one of the two members I have just referred to, said: "That as regarded the Civil Service, he maintained that the course taken by the Government was beyond all controversy right. He should be grieved to see this Bill deferred if only because it would deprive India for years of the enormous benefits which would arise from the reform in the Civil Service. The Civil Service of India was very different from any other service. In the generality of cases an incompetent officer had other people to do his work for him; he was perhaps scolded a little, but could contrive to get on without doing any serious amount of mischief; but it was not so in India. The peculiarity of the Civil Service there was the vast, the tremendous amount of responsibility thrown upon every individual officer of the Government. Millions of people were completely under the control of one man, who had the power of inflicting misery on these persons; and under such circumstances it was a most sacred duty cast upon the Government to see not merely that the general average of officers was tolerably good, but that in the case of every writer sent out they obtained the best and ablest men this country could afford, and that they did not, for the sake of obliging friends and relations or any such reason, sacrifice one atom of the power of doing good towards the people whom Providence had placed under their power. It was their duty to take care that every man sent out was as able as could be found within the four seas, and where they knowingly and wilfully sent out a worse when a better was at their disposal, they might be inflicting enormous evils on a people who had every claim on their sympathies and consideration. He had read the speech of a noble Lord who with infinite knowledge, with infinite eloquence, and with infinite ingenuity, pleaded the cause of ignorance, and so persuasively, that he might say—'If I am to be persuaded I would be just as ignorant as to be as learned a teacher and no more.' That noble Lord said that public examinations were the greatest absurdity; that they would [illegible] heads; that nothing was so bad as an over-educated man; and [illegible] ing out only a number of pedants and schoolmasters. That was not the experience of that House or of the country. He would like to know who took the lead in this country? On whose lips did deliberative assemblies hang? To whose opinions did the public give heed? The men who had shone in public examinations, and carried off those very prizes which that most learned and eloquent nobleman so vehemently decried. . . . . Nothing was more distressing in the evidence that had been given before the [illegible] than the fact that the kindly feeling which had hitherto existed between the Europeans and natives whether in the army or Civil Service was on the decline—that there was not the same sympathy between them. In his opinion nothing was more likely to correct that want of sympathy than [illegible] in the intellectual standard of those to whom they entrusted the [illegible] the natives and the government of the country; because in the fir[illegible] s a close connection between the moral and intellectual qualities of the human mind; and in the second place it was well known that ignorance and stupidity led to the harsh and brutal treatment of inferiors." The other member I have spoken of was no less than Lord, then Mr. Macaulay. He spoke on the subject as follows:—"It appears we are agreed that it is of the highest importance that the Civil Service of India should be most capable and efficient. In this case it certainly necessarily follows that we ought to watch with the utmost care over the road to admission to that service—that we ought if possible to take such measures that this service may consist entirely of picked men, of superior men taken from the flower of the youth of India. Now it is because in my opinion this Bill does tend to produce that effect that I feel earnestly desirous that it should pass, and pass without delay. My right honourable friend, Sir C. Wood, proposes that all places in the Civil Service—all admissions to the Civil Service—shall be distributed among young men by competition in those studies—as I understand the plan—which constitute a liberal British education. That plan was originally suggested by Lord Granville in 1813 in a speech which, though I do not concur in every part of it, I would earnestly recommend every gentleman to read, for I believe that since the death of Burke nothing more remarkable has been delivered. Nothing, however, on this point was then done, and the matter slept till 1833, when my friend Lord Glenelg, the purest and most disinterested of men, proposed the adoption of a plan, not altogether framed according to those views, but still a plan which would have introduced

this principle of competition. Upon that plan twenty years ago I remember speaking here. I ought not to say here, for the then House of Commons has been burnt down, and of the audience I then addressed the greater part has passed away. But my opinion on that subject has always been the same. The Bill was passed, but difficulties were either found or made—the fault lies between the Government and this House. The Company were less to blame, and they had opposed the thing from the beginning. The enactments to which I have referred were repealed, and the patronage ran in its own course. It is now proposed to introduce this principle of competition again, and I do most earnestly entreat this House to give it a fair trial. I was truly glad to hear the noble Lord who proposed the present amendment (Lord Stanley) express approval of the general principle of that part of the Bill. I was glad but not surprised at it, for it is what I should expect from a young man of his spirit and ability, and recent experience of academical competition. But I must say I do join with the honourable member for Kidderminster (Mr. Lowe) in feeling some surprise at the manner in which that part of the plan has been spoken of by a nobleman of great eminence, once President of the Board of Control and Governor-General of India, and of very distinguished ability both as an orator and a statesman. If I understood the opinions imputed to that noble Lord, he thinks the proficiency of a young man in those pursuits which constitute a liberal education, is not only no indication that he is likely in after-life to make a distinguished figure, but that it positively raises a presumption that in after-life he will be overpassed by those he overcame in these early contests. I understand that the noble Lord is of opinion that young men gaining distinction in such pursuits, are likely to turn out dullards and utterly unfit for the contests of active life. And I am not sure that the noble Lord did not say that it would be better to make boxing and cricket a test of fitness than a liberal education. I must say it seems to me that there never was a fact better proved by an immense mass of evidence, by an experience almost unvaried, than this—that men who distinguish themselves in their youth above their contemporaries in academic competition almost always keep to the end of their lives the start they have gained in the earlier part of their career. This experience is so vast, that I should as soon expect to hear anyone question it as to hear it denied that arsenic is poison or that brandy is intoxicating. Take the very simplest test. Take down in any library the Cambridge Calendar. There you have the list of honours for a hundred years. Look at the list of wranglers and of junior optimes, and I will venture to say that for one man who has in after-life distinguished himself among the junior optimes, you will find twenty among the senior optimes. Look at the Oxford Calendar; look at the list of first-class men and compare with an equal number of men in the third class, and say in which list you find the majority of men who have distinguished themselves in after-life. But is not our history full of instances which prove this fact? Look at the Church, the Parliament, or the Bar. Look to the Parliament from the time when Parliamentary Government began in this country—from the days of Montague and St. John to those of Canning and Peel. You need not stop there, but come down to the time of Lord Derby and my right honourable friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Has it not always been the case that the men who were first in the competition of the schools have been the first in the competition of life? Look also to India. The ablest man who ever governed India was Warren Hastings, and was he not in the first rank of Westminster? The ablest civil servant I ever knew in India was Sir Charles Metcalfe, and was he not a man of the first standing at Eton? The most distinguished member of the aristocracy who ever governed India was Lord Wellesley. What was his Eton reputation? What was his Oxford reputation? But I must mention—I cannot refrain from mentioning—another noble and distinguished Governor-General. A few days ago, while the memory of the speech to which I have alluded was still fresh in my mind, I read in the 'Musæ Cantabrigienses' a very eloquent and classical ode, which the University of Cambridge rewarded with a gold medal. The subject was the departure of the House of Braganza from Portugal for Brazil. The young poet, who was then only seventeen, described in very Horatian language and versification the departure of the fleet, and pictured the great Portuguese navigator Vasco De Gama, and the great Portuguese poet Camoens, hovering over the armament which was to convey the fortunes of the Portuguese Monarchy to a new hemisphere; and with pleasure, not altogether unmingled with pain, I read at the bottom of that composition, the name of the Honourable Edward Law of St. John's College. I must say I saw with some considerable pleasure that the name of Lord

Ellenborough may be added to the long list of those distinguished men who in early youth have by eminent academical success given an augury of the distinguished part which they were afterwards to play in public life; and I could not but feel some concern and some surprise that a nobleman, so honourably distinguished in his youth by attention to those studies, should, in his maturer years, have descended to use language respecting them which I think would have better become the lips of Ensign Northerton or the Captain in Swift's poem, who says—

> "'A scholard, [illegible] ke loose,
> Can hardly t[illegible]
> Your Noveds and Blutucks, and Omurs and stuff,
> By Gogsns, they don't signifie this pinch of snuff.
> T[illegible]
> T[illegible] ion.'"

"The noble Lord seemed from his speech to entertain that opinion. (A laugh.)

> "'My schoolmaster called me a dunce and a fool,
> But at cuffs I was always the cock of the school.'"

"But if a recollection of his own early academical triumphs did not restrain the noble Earl from using this language, I should have thought that his filial piety would have had that effect. I should have thought that he would have remembered how eminently splendid was the academical career of that great and strong-minded magistrate, the late Lord Ellenborough; and as I have mentioned him, I will say that if there be in this world a trying test of the fitness of men for the competition of active life, and of the strength and acuteness of their practical faculties, it is to be found in the contests of the English Bar. Have not the most eminent of our judges distinguished themselves in their academical career? Look at Lord Mansfield, Lord Eldon, Lord Stowell, Sir Vicary Gibbs, Chief Justice Tindall, Lord Tenterden, and Lord Lyndhurst. Can we suppose that it was by mere accident all these obtained their high positions? Is it possible not to believe that these men maintained through life the start which they gained in youth? And is it an answer to these instances to say that you can point—as it is desirable you should be able to point—to two or three men of great powers who, having neglected the struggle when they were young, stung with remorse and generous shame, have afterwards exerted themselves to retrieve lost time, and have sometimes overtaken and surpassed those who had got far in advance of them? Of course there are such exceptions; most desirable it is that there should be, and that they should be noted, for they seem intended to encourage men who, after having thrown away their youth from levity or love of pleasure, may be inclined to throw their manhood after it in despair: but the general rule is, beyond all doubt, that which I have laid down. It is this—that those men who distinguish themselves most in academical competition when they are young, are the men who in after-life distinguish themselves most in [illegible] world. Now if this be so, I cannot conceive that we should be [illegible] India the advantage of such a test. I know there are gentlemen who say—for it has been said—'After all, this test extends only to a man's intellectual qualifications, and his character is quite as important as his intellectual qualifications.' I most readily admit that his character is as important as his intellectual qualifications; but unfortunately you have not quite so certain a test of a man's character as you have of his intellectual qualifications. Surely if there are two qualifications you want a man to possess and which it is very important he should possess, and if you have a test by which you can ascertain the presence of the one qualification, but no decisive test by which you can ascertain the presence of the other, your best course is to use the test you have and to leave as little as you possibly can to chance."

I have copied this long extract even at the risk of being charged with prolixity. But it may be asked, What has all this to do with the present measure, which leaves intact the principle of competition so far as Englishmen are concerned? In the first place, then, I maintain that these remarks are as applicable to the admission of Natives to the Civil Service as to the admission of Englishmen. If they prove anything, they prove this—first, that merit ought to be the sole door of introduction to the service, and secondly, that no test could be more permanently efficient for this purpose than a test which precluded even a possibility of any individual feelings, passions, or prejudices having a voice in the matter, than a test worked only by a mechanical system, than a test whose impartiality was guaranteed by its impassi-

bility. Nay, further, that even if a system of patronage could be devised which would not admit of jobbery, no individual or even reasonable combinations of individuals could be found whose qualifications for discriminating merit for a whole service could be relied on for any length of time so well as those of competitive examinations. To borrow again some words of Lord Macaulay, "The most unscrupulous Governor-General would dispose of his patronage under the present system more properly than an upright Governor-General under a system by which he should be at liberty to appoint any one." I cannot help remarking that the Duke of Argyll in his criticism of the competition system, carried away by his historical reminiscences, has been totally unable to grasp this deep and comprehensive view of the problem. Applied to natives or Europeans, introduced in India or [illegible] system of patronage under any form or shape whatever, is open to the [illegible] objections, and is under any circumstances far inferior to the system of competitive examinations. In the second place, it were well to remember the utterances of these great men in view of a contingency which, if this clause is passed, cannot, I apprehend, be far distant. It seems to me that the passing of this measure would open the door for the total overthrow of the competition system. The logic of popular inference is inexorable; and the day would not be far distant when the injustice of the inequality would be unanswerably advanced for an admission of Englishmen similar to that of the natives. That day would be a day of unmitigated calamity for India, the responsibility of which would lie, I cannot help saying, with the authors of this measure. It is true that the present Civil Service of India is sometimes unfavourably compared with its predecessor. I must confess I have never been able to discover the grounds of this unfavourable comparison. One stock argument which is generally used is to cite up an array of some half a dozen names, all put in the plural number, Clives and Metcalfes, Munros and Malcolms and Elphinstones. But this argument has never appeared to me anything more than a mere rhetorical flourish. For in the first place, I should say that most of these great men produced themselves, in spite of the East India Company and its Directors, and promoted themselves (on occasions of peril) to responsible appointments, which the Directors would never have thought of conferring upon them of their own free choice and motion. Their subsequent rise was due only to this successful assertion of their abilities. But, in the second place, taking this argument for what it is worth, is it any test at all of the comparative values of two entire services? The only proper test would be the average quality of the administrations, revenue, political, judicial, of the two services. In this respect I will venture to say that no one can rise after a careful perusal of the records of Indian administration without a feeling of devout thankfulness and gratitude to the authors of the Act of 1853. It seems that the advocates of the old system have forgotten the terrible exposures of gross maladministration that were elicited during the inquiries of 1784, 1813, 1833, and 1853. I must again repeat that it would be a woeful day for India when this present Civil Service should be annihilated and its principle abolished. But such would most probably be the logical sequence of the measure now before Parliament. Like the thin point of a wedge, let patronage but once secure its footing, and it fails not to penetrate and undermine the whole service. We may say, in the words of the poet:—

> "It is the little rift within the lute,
> That by and by will make the music mute,
> And ever widening slowly silence all.
> The little rift within the lover's lute,
> Or little pitted speck in garner'd fruit,
> That rotting inward slowly moulders all."

In passing from this objection, it will perhaps be more proper to take up the objection on the score of the integrity of the Civil Service. The only difficulty of treating this objection lies in its being so palpably evident. It is impossible to select men for the same service by two distinct methods without producing jealousy and rivalry. In the case of the Indian Civil Service, the evil would be [illegible]. The jealousy and rivalry between race and race would be aggravated by inequality of facility for admission, and the result would not fail to be the utter annihilation of all unity and integrity. In connection with this subject may be mentioned the effect of the measure on the training of the service. Under the present constitution of the service, merit is not only selected, but there is also provision made for training it.

The fallacy is nowadays exploded which maintained that scientific development was not necessary to ability and genius. It is now fully recognized that the greatest men are greater by training. The organization of the Civil Service embodies in itself a guarantee for graduated homogeneous training. If the present clause is passed, what becomes of that guarantee? It cannot fail to be perceived that one effect of the measure would be materially to deteriorate the average efficiency of the service in this respect.

Another result of a similar character which is likely to follow may also be mentioned here. While on the one hand the measure takes away the guarantee for such an official or departmental training as we have just described, on the other it will encourage official and departmental knowledge of a very narrow and limited kind at the expense of that preliminary general liberal education which the present competition system renders indispensable, and which alone knows how best to employ and turn to account official knowledge and experience.

The next count of our bill of indictment against this measure relates to its tendency of promoting jobbery. The Duke of Argyll has not entirely overlooked this objection. But he maintains that there is no risk whatever of the Government of India being influenced by political jobbery or family nepotism. There are no grounds given by the Duke in support of his assertion except perhaps a theoretical inference involved in the assertion itself, *viz.*—that political jobbery is confined only to family or racial nepotism. Now this is an assertion which is unwarranted by all the known facts or laws of human nature. The failing of favouritism is a feeling deeply ingrained in human nature, and is worked upon as much by a tropical as by a temperate sun. There are various species of it—there is the unscrupulous species; then there is the ignorant species. Then there is a species of a more subtle character, where the dictates of your conscience are constrained to yield more or less complacently to the dictates of what is called your heart. Now I hope I shall not be misunderstood when I say that the Government of India is no exception to the universal rule. I have no doubt that it comprises a body of men of high honour and integrity. But after admitting that, we may well say of them what Mr. Bright once said of the India Directors:—"He had not the least idea, in any observations he made either in that House or elsewhere, of bringing a charge against the East India Company—that was to say, against any individual member of the Board of Directors—as if they were anxi[illegible] India. He never had any such suspicion. He believed that the [illegible] who constituted the Board of Directors would act just abou[illegible] twenty-four persons elected by the same process, standing under the same circumstances, and surrounded by the same difficulties." We may thus fairly say of the Government of India, whatever that may mean, that if you place before them the temptation of patronage, it would not be long before there would spring up a system—if not of pure or quasi family nepotism—of at least of what I may be allowed to call protegism. Not that such a system of protegism would be the immediate consequence of the passing of the clause. The process of development, on the contrary, would most probably be slow and gradual. But this we may assert without fear of exaggeration, as warranted by all the lessons of political experience, that it would be as sure and inevitable as the growth of despotism out of an absolute monarchy. In India this process is, however, likely to be much accelerated on account of the peculiar circumstances of the relations between the governors and the governed. Whatever may be the cause of it, it is a well-known fact that the knowledge possessed of the natives of India by their rulers is by no means very extensive or accurate. There is almost a total absence of all social or even intellectual intercourse, without which it is almost impossible to form any just estimate of merit or character. Under such circumstances, the dispensers of the patronage would generally be obliged to be satisfied with second-hand information, in itself subject to the sway of a thousand influences, which it would be by no means easy or pleasant to enumerate. Add to this difficulty that of having to select from a population which, in its differences, writers on India have been so fond of comparing to the various races and nations that inhabit the whole continent of Europe. And what a task for the ablest, justest, most scrupulous, most virtuous, most discriminating dispenser of patronage! And even if we found for once such a giant of virtue and ability, the question would still remain how to perpetuate the breed of such a species. It is thus obvious that, in India, patronage would not only transform itself into protegism, but it would degenerate into protegism of a doubly unjust character.

It would not only be tainted with the dye of favouritism, but also with that of a dangerous [illegible] nty. It may, indeed, be urged against our conclusion, that it [illegible] theoretical inference eq[illegible] down b[illegible] distinguishing between [illegible], however general, and those unwarranted by any experience, we must say that there is no way of practically proving our conclusions except by referring to the manner in which the patronage of the uncovenanted appointments have been dispensed by the Government of India in the case of the natives, except in those instances which are regulated by tests similar to the existing tests of the Covenanted Service. Now, even at the risk of being charged [illegible] handling so important a subject, I must disclaim the invidious burde[illegible], particularly when I apprehend that in any general reflections on the nature of the class of unc[illegible] I might [illegible] lude some, the holders of which [illegible] duties [illegible] to themselves and advantage to [illegible] refuted the interested and [illegible] calumnies of would-be [illegible] and abilities of the natives of India. I will only mention a [illegible] has occurred to several of my friends, that it was high time that the Uncovenanted Service should be subject to some such competitive examinations as the Covenanted Civil Service.

The last objection against this measure is, that it is unjust [illegible] the natives themselves. It is unjust, because the patronage [illegible] confined to a small class of Government employés [illegible] incentive of exertion from the natives at large; i[illegible], because it takes away that potent impulse of emulation which would fight the Englishman on his own terms, and would be anxious to give while demanding fair play from him.

These are some of the positive objections against the measure. If we compare it with the other scheme which I sketched out at the commencement of this paper, we shall find that it has also negative defects of omission. No one who has watched the discussions that have taken place for some time past on the subject of the "Admission of Natives into the Civil Service," can have failed to observe that a visit to Europe has been laid down as a necessary and almost indispensable qualification for a native civil servant, by men whose Indian experience entitle their opinion to the highest weight and consideration. Now, while in our scheme we change the time of this visit to a period subsequent to the preliminary examinations, when the success of the candidate is ascertained, we fully admit the desirability of contact with English life, and of intercourse with English society. Indeed, the value of such a visit cannot be too highly estimated in a country which must guard against [illegible] and exaggerating while adopting English civilization. The Du[illegible] completely ignored this consideration in the measure he has brought forward. It was the great difficulty of the problem. Without in any way attempting to meet it, the Government measure introduces other elements highly objectionable. Indeed, it is surprising that the other measure, so long advocated by our parent body in London, should not have recommended itself to the Duke as the only one at once safe, just, and efficient. The only change [illegible] in the present organization of competitive examinations is that of [illegible] a certain limited number of appointments in the capital towns of [illegible] in London. Already the selected English candidates are kept two years in England before they are employed; so would the selected native candidates, with the advantage of seeing English life and civilization at a time when they could understand and appreciate them. The only possible objection which I have heard urged against this scheme is, that it would render the examinations here and in London unequal in their character. But surely such an objection could not be meant to be seriously urged, if we only remembered that the examinations taking place yearly at the present moment were equally unequal as if they were held at different places. The inequality is the same, whether it is that between the batch of selected candidates of one year and that of another, or whether it is that between the batch examined in one place and that examined in another. It is really entirely immaterial, so long as the average efficiency of the examinations is maintained; and it is in the hands of Government to maintain this efficiency in India as in London. And now that we have our electric cable completely laid, it is not impossible to have even the same examination papers.

In instituting this comparison between the two schemes, which require only to be brought face to face to perceive their relative values, it is impossible not to speculate

on the existence of some silent [illegible] background in the minds of the framers of the Government [illegible] give it preference. And that there is such a reason it is [illegible] a careful perusal of what has been written and spoken on this subject since 1813 by its friends as well as its opponents. Stated in plain terms, it is this—that the average morale presumed by a competitive examination is not so high among the natives of India as among Englishmen. There are two assertions involved in this argument which we will examine separately. The first is that of the relative inferiority of native to English morale. The second is, that intellectual cultivation does not induce moral improvement.

[illegible] the first dictum, I am not going to adopt the course of indignantly [illegible] idea altogether. It would be childish to do any such thing, when [illegible] not be denied that such has been the honest belief of some of the most sincere friends the natives of India ever had. On the contrary, I am going to confess that there is apparently some ground for it. But let us calmly analyse this appearance. In the first place, an impartial comparison requires an independent standard. Now Englishmen always unconsciously compare English and Indian moralities by the tests of their own civilization. Now there can be no greater fallacy than this. I remember, during the late Reform debates, the leaders of both the parties in the House of Commons startling Englishmen by informing them that, in spite of [illegible] session on the subject, there was perhaps more social and political [illegible] than in England. The fallacy of the popular English opinion on the subject was that it persisted in gauging French liberty by certain forms and indices which represented it in their own country. Englishmen commit the same mistake in judging of Indian morality as they do in estimating French liberty. The science of comparative history shows us that it is quite possible that one morality may set greater store by one set of virtues, and another by an altogether different set. And if you attempt to judge of the one by the prominent characteristics of the other, the result must be at the same time unfavourable and unjust. Now English civilization is particul[illegible] int of its political morality. In India, on the contrary, where [illegible] was, generally speaking, never allowed to advance beyond the ideal of "a good king," it has not perhaps arrived at the same perfection. But again Indian would be found superior to English morality in several other social respects, such as in point of charity, hospitality, &c. From this point of view it may be perceived that, [illegible] rent characteristics, it would be difficult to say that English [illegible] and absolutely superior to Indian morality. In the second p[illegible] lement of error in the English judgment about Indian morality. This judgment is chiefly based upon the English experience of the morality of native employés of a very inferior class, who, badly remunerated, are not conspicuous for honesty or integrity. But would Englishmen placed in a similar position be impregnable to bribery and corruption? We must be strar[illegible] Indian history if we did not remember that, even in high positions, [illegible] ong as the remuneration for their services was inadequate to their [illegible] boasted integrity and gave in to the most rapacious extortions. But would all this be allowed to impeach at the present day the unquestionable integrity of English officials of the higher class? By no means. But then in common fairness no such presumption should be allowed to operate against the natives of India when placed in positions of responsibility and trust, and remunerated accordingly. The want of honesty discovered in certain people under certain circumstances no more indicates a low state of national morality among the natives than among Englishmen. If we were disposed to recriminate, the annals of English history are not difficult of access, and the long and continuous tale which they tell of parliamentary corruption, bribery, and treachery, beginning with the exploits of Danby and not ending with those of Pelham and Walpole, is, though undoubtedly instructive, far from being very edifying. The recrimination, however, would be as unjust and inconclusive as the charge in whose defence it would be employed.

The next dictum we have to examine is, that intellectual cultivation does not induce moral cultivation. To avoid misunderstanding, let us say from the beginning that we define intellectual cultivation not as [illegible] vely confined to a sort of pure mathematical training, but a culture [illegible] upon what are sometimes concisely termed "humanities." After [illegible] we may say that the dictum is both true and false. This is no paradox, but a description which may be

faithfully given of generalizations, too wide if taken absolutely, and true only relatively with respect to certain times and circumstances. It would be hardly tenable to say, that monarchy was the best form of Government; still the proposition could be maintained if applied to early states of society. Just in the same manner, if we denied our dictum with respect to all times and all states of society, the proposition would be far from being warranted by facts. For example, if we took those periods in the development of a society when morality did not ex[illegible] was still absorbed in religion, it would be perfectly true to say that [illegible] did not teach morality. Thus, during the early ages of Christianity, what intellectual training there was would have been utterly insufficient to form the morale of its pupils. In those days nothing could have performed that task so well and so thoroughly as a religious education. History abounds with instances of such periods. There was a time when J[illegible] ts sole and best culture in the Mosaic books. There was a time [illegible] to look only [illegible] of such men as Homer and Hesiod; there was a time when M[illegible] or its civilization on the Koran alone. The next stage, h[illegible] these societies, if they succeed in advancing to it, is one in v[illegible] itself from its religious shackles and appears under other [illegible] Such has been the case with English in common with all Western civilization. The Apostles and the Fathers are now superseded by poets and historians and philosophers. Not that these people have taken to [illegible]icating directly and indirectly the moral precepts once containe[illegible] commentaries. The transformation takes place in a less demonstrative manner. The religious teaching slowly distributes itself in the shape of moral axioms and ideas, which in their tradition from posterity to posterity, instil themselves into the mind as its first principles. These first principles mould in after-life all your thoughts, your actions, and your utterances. The poet, the historian, the philosopher, cannot sing or write but on the condition of remaining true to this heritage which they receive. And once you have a complete literature so thoroughly and unconsciously imbued with the highest moral teaching of the day, then religion has done its peculiar work, and intellectual education coincides with moral cultivation. In a recent lecture delivered at Cambridge, Professor Seeley forcibly points out the value of history in education as the school of statesmanship. With perhaps greater force and truth it may be said that, as a means of education, history, in common with other branches of literature, is, first and foremost, the school of morality. We may say, then, that the dictum that we laid down above is not true, if applied to an education which has for its principal instrument such a literature as we have described. And that English civilization is possessed of such a literature will hardly be denied by impartial men. We are thus irresistibly led to admit that the competitive examinations of the Civil Service, in testing intellectual ability, at the same time efficiently tests the morale of the candidates, whether they be Europeans or natives. And this conclusion is [illegible]y corroborated in the case of natives by our [illegible] the effect of [illegible] in Indian schools and colleges. Out of [illegible] only one. The late Director of Public Instruction, whose [illegible] observation were equal to his abilities to interpret them, says in one of his reports,—"In the college I have invariably found that students improve in trustworthiness and respectability, in direct ratio to their improvement as scholars." This testimony tallies exactly with our *a priori* reasoning. We may now conclude our examination of the only reason we can think of for the rejection of our scheme, with the unhesitating declaration that it is nothing but a tissue of subtle errors and plausible fallacies.

To sum up the main points of this paper. I hope I have now succeeded in showing to you that the measure in progress through Parliament is of a most dangerous and pernicious character, that it is not the only expedient for affording facilities for the admission of natives into the Civil Service of India, and that the present system can with perfect safety be extended for that purpose without destroying its most characteristic features. And, moreover, the leading advocates of the competition system when they introduced it in the Act of 1853 were far from being unmindful of such a contingency as the present. They distinctly foresaw that the principle of competition would be applicable to natives as well as Europeans. Lord Macaulay was one of those who clearly realized this fact, and in closing this paper I cannot do better than quote to you his remarks on the subject. He says,—

"It seems to me that this plan provides the best means that can be imagined for effecting an object upon which much has been said and which I admit to be desirable —the gradual admission of natives to a share in the higher offices of Government. . . . . I can conceive nothing more unfortunate for the people of India than that you should put into the Civil Service a native because he is a native, if he is to be the last man in that service, a man decidedly inferior in attainments to all the other members of that service, and who would be looked down upon by his European colleagues. Above all, I cannot conceive anything more pernicious than the suggestion which has been made, that before you admit any native to the service at all, before any native has been an assistant collector or a judge, you should take some native and appoint him a member of the Legislative Council. That of all propositions would seem to me least likely to promote the real benefit of the people of India. Under the proposed system, it would depend on the natives themselves, and upon them alone, at what time they should enter into the Civil Service. As soon as any native of distinguished parts should by the cultivation of English literature have enabled himself to be victorious in competition over European candidates, he would in the most honourable manner, by conquest, as a matter of right, and not as a mere eleemosynary donation, obtain access to the service. It would then be utterly impossible for his European fellows to look down upon him; he would enter the service in the best and most honourable way; and I believe that in this mode, and this mode alone, can the object which so many friends of the native population have in view, be attained in a manner at all satisfactory." Considering the time when these remarks were uttered, I cannot imagine a more forcible or a more eloquent commentary on the two measures compared in this paper for the admission of natives into the Civil Service.

Dr. J. N. MENDOÇA said:—Mr. Chairman and G[illegible] B[illegible] I am a devoted disciple of Esculapius, as we are sometimes c[illegible], whose chief business of life is to feel the pulse and write prescriptions, I can hardly pretend to offer an opinion on a subject which requires some special study and research. Nor do I think it necessary for me thus to trespass upon your time and attention in view of the full and exhaustive manner in which the subject has been laid before the meeting. Nevertheless, as one not altogether unaccustomed to look beyond the precincts of medicine and surgery, and having paid particular attention to the paper as it was being read, I feel bound to confess that the opinions and sentiments expressed therein ought certainly to command the cordial sympathy and concurrence of everyone present here to-day. (Applause.) The subject, as you know, is one of vital importance; and, considering the vast interests involved, I have no doubt will receive careful and serious attention from all who have the welfare of this country at heart. In conclusion, I need hardly say how deeply this Society is indebted to Mr. Pherozshah for his interesting paper; and as I remarked on the occasion of his first lecture before this Association, he deserves our best thanks as much for the happy choice of his subject as for the able and elaborate manner in which he has handled it. (Applause.)

After a few remarks from Mr. Mahadeva G. Ranade, the debate was adjourned to a future day, to be appointed hereafter, on the motion of Messrs. Wagle and Vundrawun Purshotum.

A vote of thanks to Mr. Mehta was proposed by Mr. Wagle, and seconded by Mr. Thakardass Atmaram, and unanimously carried.

After a vote of thanks to the Chair, the meeting separated.

The adjourned meeting of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association for the discussion of Mr. Pherozshah M. Mehta's paper on Clause 6 of East India (Laws and Regulations) Act was held at the Framjee Cawasjee Institute, on Wednesday, the [illegible], at six o'clock P.M.

On the motion of Messrs. Mehta and Kaikhosru N. Kabra, Mr. Muncherjee C. Murzban was called to the chair.

Dr. J. N. MENDOÇA then moved the adoption of the following resolutions:—

1. That this meeting, with [illegible] liberal spirit and generous intentions which have influenced the [illegible] in passing the East India (Laws and Regulations) Act, is of opinion that Clause 6 of the Act violates the integrity of the

principle of competition with respect to the Civil Service of India, and is thereby calculated to deteriorate its high average of efficiency and trustworthiness.

2. That in the opinion of this meeting, the clause is likely to lead to the perpetration of political jobbery.

3. That it does not open the Civil Service of India to the natives "in the most honourable manner," in the words of the late Lord Macaulay, "by conquest, as a matter of right, and not as a mere eleemosynary donation."

4. That the natives of India, while protesting against exceptional obstructions which are not shared generally, are, however, ambitious of obtaining admission to the Civil Service of their country in fair fight and open competition.

5. That the Managing Committee of the Branch will be good enough to request the Council of the East India Association to take this subject into their serious consideration.

The resolutions were seconded by Mr. Thakardass Atmaram in a speech of some length.

Messrs. Janardhan, S. Gadgil, Shapoorjee B. Bharoocha, and Kaikhosru N. Kabra then addressed the meeting. The resolutions were carried. After a vote of thanks to the Chairman, the meeting separated.

APPENDIX.

EAST INDIA (LAWS AND REGULATIONS).

33 VICT. CHAP. 3.

An Act to make better provision for making laws and regulations for certain parts of India, and for certain other purposes relating thereto. [25th March, 1870.]

WHEREAS it is expedient that provision should be made to enable the Governor-General of India in Council to make regulations for the peace and good government of certain territories in India, otherwise than at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations held under the provisions of The Indian Council's Act, 1861, and also for certain other purposes connected with the Government of India:

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. Every governor of a Presidency in Council, lieutenant-governor, or chief commissioner, whether the governorship, or lieutenant governorship, or chief commissionership be now in existence or may hereafter be established, shall have power to propose to the Governor-General in Council drafts of any regulations, together with the reasons [illegible] the same, for the peace and government of any part or parts of the [illegible] his government or administration to which the Secretary of State for India shall from time to time by resolution in council declare the provisions of this section to be applicable from any date to be fixed in such resolution.

And the Governor-General in Council shall take such drafts and reasons into consideration; and when any such draft shall have been approved of by the Governor-General in Council, and shall have received the Governor-General's assent, it shall be published in the 'Gazette of India' and in the local 'Gazette,' and shall thereupon have like force of law and be subject to the like disallowances as if it had been made by the Governor-General of India in Council at a meeting for the purpose of making laws and regulations.

The Secretary of State for India in Council may from time to time withdraw such

power from [illegible] or chief commissioner, on whom it has been co[illegible] restore the same as he shall think fit.

2. The [illegible] the Secretary of State for India in Council an authentic copy of every regulation which shall have been made under the provisions of this Act; and all laws or regulations hereafter made by the Governor-General of India in Council, whether at a meeting for the purpose of making laws and regulations, or under the said provisions, shall control and supersede any regulation in anywise repugnant thereto which shall have been made under the same provisions.

3. Whenever the Governor-General in Council shall hold a meeting for the purpose of making laws and regulations at any place within the limits of any territories now or hereafter placed under the administration of [illegible] or a chief commissioner, the lieutenant-governor or chief comm[illegible] shall be *ex officio* an additional member of the council of the [illegible] that purpose, in excess (if necessary) of the maximum number of twelve specified by the said Act.

4. Section forty-nine of the Act of the third and fourth years of King William the Fourth, chapter eighty-five, is hereby repealed.

5. Whenever any measure shall be proposed before the Governor-General of India in Council whereby the safety, tranquillity, or interests of the British possessions in India, or any part thereof, are or may be, in the judgment of the said Governor-General, essentially affected, and he shall be of opinion either that the measure proposed ought to be adopted and carried into execution, or that it ought to be suspended or rejected, and the majority in council then present shall dissent from such opinion, the Governor-General may, on his own authority and [illegible]spend or reject the measure in part or in whole, or adopt and carry [illegible], but in every such case any two members of the dissentient majority may require that the said suspension, rejection, or adoption, as well as the fact of their dissent, shall be notified to the Secretary of State for India, and such notification shall be accompanied by copies of the minutes (if any) which the members of the council shall have recorded on the subject.

6. Whereas it is expedient that additional facilities should be given for the employment of natives of India, of proved merit and ability, in the Civil Service of Her Majesty in India; Be it enacted, that nothing in the "Act for the government of India," twenty-one and twenty-two Victoria, chapter one hundred and six, or in the "Act to confirm certain appointments in India, and to amend the law concerning the Civil Service there," twenty-four and twenty-five Victoria, chapter fifty-four, or in any other Act of Parliament or other law now in force in India, shall restrain the authorities in India by whom appointments are or may be made to offices, places, and employments in the Civil Service of Her Majesty in India from appointing any native of India to any such office, place, or employment, although such native shall not have been admitted to the said Civil Service of India in manner in section thirty-two of the first-mentioned Act provided, but subject to such rules as may be from time to time prescribed by the Governor-General in Council, and sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council, with the concurrence of a majority of members present; and that for the purpose of this Act the words "natives of India" shall include any person born and domiciled within the dominions of Her Majesty in India, of parents habitually resident in India, and not established there for temporary purposes only; and that it shall be lawful for the Governor-General in Council to define and limit from time to time the qualification of natives of India thus expressed; provided that every resolution made by him for such purpose shall be subject to the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council, and shall not have force until it has been laid for thirty days before both Houses of Parliament.

JOURNAL

OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1871.

SIR BARTLE FRERE, K.C.B., G.C.S.I., IN THE CHAIR.

The following Paper was read by MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI :—

On the Commerce of India.

THE commerce of India is one of the most important subjects that can engage the attention of the public of England. I do not think the audience before me needs to be told the reason why. They know well enough how the prosperity of this country, as of any other, depends chiefly upon its commerce, and how important it is to them that the vast continent of India, with its teeming population, should be opened up for their commercial enterprise. It is a calamity to India, and a great loss to this country, that the subject of the commerce of India is not fully considered by the public or press of England, and that even the merchants and manufacturers do not give to it the attention it demands. I am constrained to say, after my residence in this country for fifteen years, that the knowledge of the public here about India is not only imperfect, but in some matters mischievously incorrect. But why should I blame the English public or others, when those who ought to know best, and upon the information furnished by whom the public must depend, the past India House itself has made statements entirely at variance with facts? I do not wish to blame anybody, but set it down with grief to the misfortune of India. The Parliamentary return, No. 75 of 1858, gives "A Memorandum (prepared at the India House) of the Improvements in the Administration of India during the last thirty years." This return, at page 11, gives a paragraph entitled "General Prosperity." In the part referring to the commerce of India, after giving figures for exports and imports of India, at the interval of twenty-one years (from 1834 to 1855) the paragraph ends, in relation to the commerce of India for these twenty-one years, with the strange words, "The great excess of exports above imports (of merchandise) being regularly liquidated in silver." It also states that the exports of merchandise [illegible] per cent., and imports 227 per cent., during the same twenty-one years.

I cannot trouble you at present with several other fallacious statements in this paragraph. I confine myself at present to those I have mentioned about the trade of India. It is a wonder to me how this statement about the liquidation in silver of the excess of exports over imports could have issued from the India House. A return (No. 369) made by the India House itself, on Mr. Bright's motion, in the year 1853,

gives the total imports and exports of India. The total exports, according to this return, *including* all treasure for the first fifteen years (1834 to 1850) out of the twenty-one to which the return of 1858 refers, are given as a little above 231,000,000*l.*, and the total imports of India, *including* all treasure, a little above 163,500,000*l.*, leaving a difference of 67,500,000*l.* of excess of exports above imports, for which, neither in the shape of silver nor of any other goods, has there been any import whatsoever into India. So far, therefore, for the first fifteen years' "regular liquidation in silver" for 67,500,000*l.* of excess of exports was simply a creation of imagination.

Now, let us see about the remaining six years. The return (No. 3891 of 1867) gives the total of exports, including treasure, about 125,500,000*l.*, and the total of imports, including treasure, about 105,000,000*l.* These imports include the loan for railways remitted up to the year 1856. I take this remittance to be only 10,000,000*l.*, as a low figure, as I cannot get from official returns the exact amount. Deducting this, and not making any allowance for any remittances on account of public debt made during the same period, the total amount of imports is about 95,500,000*l.*, or "the excess of exports above imports" of about 30,000,000*l.* which was *not* liquidated either in silver or in any other goods. Thus we have a total of about 97,000,000*l.*; and allowing, to some extent, for the amount of public loans raised in England and remitted to India during the twenty-one years under consideration, an "excess of exports above imports" of above 100,000,000*l.* which was never liquidated in silver or in other goods. To this must be added about 30,000,000*l.* of profit on exports, thus making about 130,000,000*l.* for which India has received no return in imports. And yet the India House coolly told the English public, in the year 1858, that during the twenty-one years previous to 1856, "the great excess of exports above imports was regularly liquidated in silver." I appeal to you, gentlemen, to say whether there ever was a more misleading statement made; and is it a wonder that the English public are indifferent to the complaints of India? The India House would have been correct if it had said that the great excess of exports above imports of India, during the twenty-one years, amounting to above 130,000,000*l.*, was retained for the benefit of England. Now, I would not have alluded to a statement made twelve years ago, were it not that I have seen its mischievous effects to the present day. So far as my reading goes, I have not come across a single statement in the subsequent Parliamentary returns which distinctly and directly corrects it, and in my conversation generally, except in very few instances, I have found that this misleading statement has led to the almost universal belief that India is rich and prosperous, when it is not so. No more have the imports, with all silver included, been equal to exports after 1856. Notwithstanding the so-much-talked-of wealth poured in during the American war, the total figures are, for 1856 to 1869,* exports (including treasure), about 588,000,000*l.*; imports (including treasure), about 545,000,000*l.* Out of these imports, about 72,000,000*l.* (the total expended till end of 1869 being 82,000,000*l.*, of

* 'Parliamentary Return,' 3891 of 1867, and C. 184 of 1870.

which I have taken 10,000,000*l.*, the total to 1856) are railway loans, about 27,000,000*l.* are public loans raised in England, and about 15,000,000*l.** of registered debt of India, transferred to this country, leaving the actual imports in exchange for exports about 431,000,000*l.* This gives an excess of exports above imports of about 157,000,000*l.* during the last thirteen years, which is not liquidated either in silver or in any other goods. Add to this the profits of the export, say about 60,000,000*l.*, making a total of above 210,000,000*l.*, for which there is no commercial imports into India.

Now, instead of a misleading statement, that the "great excess of exports over imports was liquidated in silver," if the English public were told that during the past thirty-four years exports for about 260,000,000*l.* have had no corresponding material return in imports, nor the ordinary commercial profits of these thirty-four years, to the extent of some 90,000,000*l.*, had been returned to India, its attention would be naturally directed to the strange phenomenon; for everyone knows that in the ordinary course of commerce every country gets a full return with some profit for its exports, and that it is simply impossible for any country to carry on such a commerce as that of India without being impoverished, unless special means are adopted to counteract the evil.

I propose to consider, 1st, the real extent of the commerce of India; 2nd, the reason why it is extremely limited, notwithstanding the progress it has to some extent made; 3rd, what suitable remedies should be adopted for such an unsatisfactory state of affairs. First, we may see what the extent of the real commerce of India is. I take the latest year for which I can get returns. The table for exports from India, as given in Return C., 184 of 1870, including treasure, gives the amount for the year 1868–9 about 53,700,000*l.*, and imports, including treasure, about 51,000,000*l.* Now, we must examine whether these figures represent the commerce of India. I have no doubt every gentleman here reads the little paragraph in the money articles of the daily newspapers, about the bills drawn by the Secretary of State for India. I would not undertake to say how many readers of that little paragraph understand its full significance, or care to do so. I am afraid the number is not large. The total of these bills for the last official year was estimated at about 7,000,000*l.* What are these bills drawn for? Certainly not for any commercial purpose. What is the operation of these bills? It is simply this, that out of the proceeds of the exports from India the Indian Secretary keeps 7,000,000*l.* here, and India receives no corresponding commercial import for the amount. In this manner, what are called "the charges in England on the revenues of India" are paid, that is, India exports about 7,000,000*l.* worth of produce to pay for these charges.† You will therefore see that out of the so-called exports of India, about 7,000,000*l.* are not commercial exports at all. Next, in India there are about 2500 English civilians, covenanted and uncovenanted, about 5000 English military officers, and some 60,000 soldiers. All these naturally remit to this country, for the

* 'Parliamentary Return' 258 of 1869.

† The "charges on the revenues of India," disbursed in England, are, for 1869–70, above 7,700,000*l.*; and those for 1868–69 about 7,350,000*l.* I put down, say 7,000,000*l.* Return 234 of 1870.

education of their children, and for the support of their families and dependent friends, and bring with them their savings. The total of their pay is about 9,000,000*l.*, and I put down what an English friend, who ought to know well, tells me is a low estimate, about half for the remittances I have alluded to. There are, besides, certain English goods especially wanted for the consumption of Europeans in India. If I, therefore, take 5,000,000*l.* as the exports of India for all these purposes, to say nothing of remittances by non-official Englishmen, such as barristers, solicitors, doctors, merchants, planters, &c., making up a large sum, I shall be found much under the mark. Thus, then, we have a total of about 12,000,000*l.*, out of the so-called exports, which do not form a part of the commerce of India at all, whatever else they may be. I cannot discuss what they really are, or what their significance is, before this Society. I may just tell you that Sir George Wingate calls this item the "tribute" India pays to England; or that another intelligent Englishman calls it the "salary of England" for ruling over India. Be that as it may, one thing is clear, that these 12,000,000*l.* are not a part of the commerce of the country, and for which there is no liquidation either in silver or any other goods. India must send out annually at least 12,000,000*l.* worth of produce, whether it will or no, without any corresponding commercial return. Besides the above two items, there is another which strictly is not commercial. I mean the remittance of interest from India on railways, irrigation, and other such loans. I must not be misunderstood, however. I consider these loans as one of those things for which India is under special obligations to this country. I do not allude to this item in any spirit of complaint. Far from it. On the contrary, I always think of it with great thankfulness. It is a blessing both to the receiver and the giver. I only mean that the interest, even supposing it to be all earned by the railways, though forming a part of the exports of India, is not a part of the commerce of India. This item is about 4,000,000*l.*, making altogether about 16,000,000*l.* of exports from India which are not commercial. The balance of the exports representing the real commerce of the country is therefore about 37,000,000*l.* for 1868–9.

Let us now analyze the imports. The total is about 51,000,000*l.* We must deduct the following items as not commercial:—Railway loan for the year, about 5,000,000*l.*; irrigation, State railways, and other loans which I have not been able to ascertain, say about 2,000,000*l.*; Government stores, about 1,500,000*l.*; payment on account of the Abyssinian expedition, about 1,250,000*l.*; leaving about 41,250,000*l.* as commercial imports. So we have roughly considered about 37,000,000*l.* exports, and 41,000,000*l.* imports. This shows something like a national commercial profit of about 4,000,000*l.* But as, on the other hand, India has had to pay to this country 12,000,000*l.* for its administration, the real balance of India's profit and loss account is some 8,000,000*l.* on the wrong side for the year.

Leaving the question of the nature and consequences of this balance alone for the present, we have this remarkable fact, that while the exports of the produce of the United Kingdom are nearly 6*l.* 10*s.* a head of population, of British North America about 3*l.* a head, and of Australia

about 19*l.* a head, for 1868, those of India are scarcely 4*s.* a head, or altogether, including political and non-commercial remittances to this country, about 5*s.* a head. Even deducting the gold exports, the other exports of Australia are about 11*l.* per head.

I may remark here, that just as the India House liquidation in silver of excess of exports is incorrect, so does its assertion of the increase of 188 per cent. in exports, and 227 per cent. in imports, require explanation. From what I have already said, you may have seen that a good portion of this increase is owing to causes other than commercial, *viz.* increase of political charges in England, of national debt, and the increasing remittances of official and non-official Europeans.

The question is often asked, why India does not take largely of British manufactures? Why is it that, with a population of 200,000,000, there are only about 17,500,000*l.* worth of British manufactures, or less even than 2*s.* a head, exported to India, while Australia, with a population of less than 2,000,000, takes about 13,000,000*l.*, or more than 6*l.* a head, and British North America, with its population of about 4,500,000, about 5,000,000*l.*, or about 25*s.* a head? Before I proceed to a discussion of this scantiness of the export of British manufactures into India, I must clear away two misapprehensions. On account of such misleading statements as those of the India House, and a quantity of silver being actually imported into India, it is a general impression here that India is a great sink for silver, that there is great hoarding, and that it is rich. The fact is, first, that India has not imported as much silver as the India House statement leads one to believe; and secondly, that under the British administration, silver has naturally become a necessary commodity. The revenue having to be paid in cash, a great demand arose for coins, and silver not being produced in the country, its importation became a necessity. Besides coins, it must also be remembered that, as in all countries, several social customs require the use of a certain quantity of the precious metals. I am not at all here taking into consideration the withdrawal of the treasure from India that had taken place in the earlier times of the East India Company. And yet, see what the gross total amount of bullion is which India has retained during the whole period of the last seventy years, from the commencement of the present century. I think you would hardly believe me when I say it is only about 34*s.** a head. Conceive, gentlemen, 34*s.* a head, not per annum, but in the whole course of seventy years, for all purposes, commercial, social, and political, for circulation, wear and tear, for remittances, for railway and other *loans*, and to fill up the drain of former periods—in short, for every possible purpose.

Why, in the United Kingdom, for the last twelve years only, from 1858 to 1869 (there are no earlier returns for imports), you have retained for your national uses nearly 30*s.* a head, besides leaving about 18,000,000*l.* in the Bank of England intact at the ends of 1857 and 1869. There may be some little hoarding by some men, as the means of investment and circulation in India are not yet developed; but may I ask whether there is any gentleman now present who has not some hoarding about

* Return 133 of 1864 and [C. 184] of 1870.

him of several pounds in his watches, pins, &c.? However, here is the *whole* quantity of bullion imported into India during seventy years, 34*s.* per head. Now, in discussing the question why India takes less than 2*s.*, or about 1*s.* 9*d.*, a head of British manufactures, you will see that the general cry of large imports of silver being the cause is not correct. The wonder is that 34*s.* a head, received in the whole period of seventy years, could be sufficient for all necessary wants and wear.

The second misapprehension which requires explanation is the notion that wages and prices have risen enormously, and that therefore India is very prosperous. This notion is not only an exaggeration, but it is also incorrect to a great extent. It would be impossible for me to discuss it to-night, as it would require a long time to do so clearly. I need simply say, what I think I am able to prove from actual facts and official documents, that though there is some general rise in prices (not, however, to the extent usually supposed), it is not an addition to former sufficiency, but a return from a low ebb, to which it had gone down before, and that it only indicates some progress towards, but not actual, sufficiency, much less prosperity. There is much confusion of ideas on this subject. For instance, while some writers point to rise in prices as a proof of prosperity, the India House return, in the same paragraph to which I have already referred, speaks of "the cheapening of agricultural produce" as a matter to boast about. Now, the "enormous" or "unexampled" rise in prices or wages, about which so much noise is made by some writers, is no more true than that because there may be a few millionaires in London, therefore all Londoners are millionaires. The phenomenon is simply this, that in special localities, where railway and other public works are being constructed, money congests, and prices and wages for a time go very high, because, on account of imperfect communication, neither labour nor food is drawn there in sufficient quantity to equalize or moderate wages or prices. And because at some of these special localities prices and wages rise very high, a general conclusion is hastily drawn, as if prices and wages had gone up enormously all over India. I shall give hereafter a few instances of prices, which will show that the notion of enormous general rise in prices is incorrect.

I must now return to the question of the causes of the miserable extent to which the natives of India take of British manufacture. Do not, gentlemen, for a moment suppose that a native does not wish to put on a better coat—or rather a coat at all—if he can get it. You should seriously ask the question why India does not afford to English industry and enterprise a field commensurate with its vast extent, population, and natural resources, though it is under your own control and administration. If this country could export of its produce only 1*l.* a head of India's population, it will be as much as you now export to all parts of the world.

There is no question of the vastness and variety of India's resources. The number of principal articles it exports to this country is above fifty, many of them in great varieties, and some two or three dozen of minor importance. Much more can this number be increased. Why should not India alone supply to this country cotton, coffee, sugar, tea, silk, seeds, fibre, or anything else, in any quantity wanted? The causes of this unsatisfactory state of affairs are various, both moral and material.

The moral causes I am sorry I cannot discuss before this Society; I shall only mention them. As long as a people have no reasonable voice, or have only a farce of a voice, in the legislation and taxation, municipal or imperial, of their own country, it is simply impossible there can be that watchful care and attention to its wants which those most interested alone can give. So, also, as long as the people of a country have no fair share in its administration, the powerful stimulus of patriotism and self-interest cannot come into action. Moreover, this want of a proper share for the native in the administration of the country produces one deplorable moral evil: as long as the English are officials, their mouths are shut. All the wisdom acquired by their experience is of no use in guiding the natives. The moment they are non-official they leave the country, and thus drain poor India of wisdom also. After coming to this country, the majority of these retired English officials forget India. Here, for instance, is Lord Lawrence. I congratulate the London School Board on such an acquisition, but there is also another side of the picture. What does this mean to India? Here is wisdom of above thirty years, I suppose, acquired in India, and it is all now lost to it. When and how will India have its own Lawrences, its Freres, Trevelyans, &c., to guide the nation towards progress, enlightenment, and prosperity? This is most deplorable for India that natives are not allowed a due share in the administration, to acquire the necessary wisdom of experience to become the guiding spirits of the country.

One more moral cause I would just touch upon, is the want of adequate education. Most sincerely thankful as I am for even the small extent to which education has progressed, I need simply say just now that education, both high English and professional for the higher classes, and vernacular and industrial for the mass, is far from being adequate, and yet Government are committing the political suicide of discouraging English education in Bengal.

Having thus simply stated the three moral causes, I now come to the material. What, I wonder, would you say to the following fact? I have been studying for the past six months the administration reports of the different Presidencies of India. From these and other sources (thanks to Mr. Grant Duff, and other gentlemen in the India Office, for lending me any books I wanted), I have myself worked out, as a rough outside estimate, the total gross produce of all cultivated land in the average good season of 1867–8:—Central Provinces, North-West Provinces, Madras Presidency, Bengal Presidency, and Oudh, less than 40*s.* a head of their respective population; Punjaub produced less than 50*s.* a head; and the Bombay Presidency, with all the advantages of the late American war, railway loans, and three lines of railway converging into it, produced 100*s.* a head. But even Bombay, I am afraid, on account of disastrous losses during the last five years, is gradually lowering its level. The average of all British India will be a good deal under 50*s.* a head per annum, or say 1*s.* a head á week. If I put 80*s.* a head per annum, or 1*s.* 6*d.* per week per head, as the total production of all kinds (agricultural manufacturing, mineral, &c.) of the country, I shall be, I cannot help thinking, guilty of exaggeration or over-estimate.

With this low production we must bear in mind that a larger pro-

portion goes for the consumption of the Europeans in India, of the higher and middle classes of natives, 12,000,000*l.* a year are to be exported to this country, and a portion is to be reserved for seed, and then we may ask how much of this 1*s.* 6*d.* a week a head could go to the share of the poor mass, from whose labour, after all, must all production be raised. Is not this one cause alone quite enough to explain the whole problem why India is such a poor and wretched customer of England? Is it any wonder, then, that Lord Lawrence deliberately stated, in 1864, that "India is, on the whole, a very poor country; the mass of the population enjoy only a scanty subsistence;" and that Mr. George Campbell, in his paper on "Tenures of Land in India," published by the Cobden Club, quotes from an official authority a report made so late as 1869, about the Madras Presidency, as follows:—"The bulk of the people are paupers. They can just pay their cesses in a good year, and fail altogether when the season is bad. Remissions have to be made perhaps every third year in most districts. There is a bad year in some one district, or group of districts every year." Lastly, I would refer to an incidental remark made in the Calcutta correspondence of 'The Times,' published as late as the 12th December last. It says:—"But an ordinary native can live comfortably on about 2*d.* a day. He only needs a few rags for clothing, a little rice, and pulse or bean, and 'curry stuff.'"

Now, I ask you, gentlemen, whether it is from such men, who are obliged to be satisfied with 2*d.* a day, a few rags, and wretched hovels, that you can expect to raise 50,000,000*l.* of annual revenue (nearly one-fourth of which has to be remitted to this country); or even 1*l.* a head, or 200,000,000*l.* of commercial exports, receiving large imports of your British manufactures in return? Pray do not suppose the native would not like to be better fed, clothed, and lodged. Such a supposition will be simply contrary to human nature and to fact. Let us examine a little more closely. Insufficient as the whole production is, and scanty as must be the share of it for the great bulk of the population, perhaps hardly 1*s.* a head a week, the mischief is further aggravated by imperfect distribution, so that the plenty of any one part is not available for the scarcity or famine of another. The best test of this is the difference in the price of food in different parts. If wheat sold at 50*s.* in one part of this country, and 70*s.* or 80*s.* in another part, I wonder how long this Society, or the English public, would allow such a state of things to endure? In Punjaub, in 1869, the average price in Delhi was 52 lbs. of wheat per rupee, while at Mooltan, 34 lbs.; and at Peshawar, 30 lbs.

In the Madras Presidency, in the year 1867–68, a good season year, at Cuddapa, the price of rice is 492 rupees per garce (9256¼ lbs.), at Vezagapatam it is 203 rupees, and Godavery, 222 rupees. In the North-West Provinces, for the month of June, 1868, as the month of average plenty, at Meerut, wheat is 54 lbs. for 1 rupee, but at Allahabad and Mirzapore only 34 lbs. In the Central Provinces, in 1867–68, an average good-season year, rice, at Hoosingabad is 5 rupees for 1 maund (80 lbs.), while at Rypore and Belaspore it is only 1 rupee; at Sumbulpore, 1 rupee 2 annas. In the Bombay Presidency, for February, 1868, as a month of average plenty, at Dharwar, the price of jowaree is 84 lbs. for 1 rupee, while at Thanna it is 27 lbs. per 1 rupee. Again, bajree at

Dharwar is 80 lbs. per 1 rupee, while at Dhoolia only 26 lbs., and at Broach and Thanna only 24 lbs. (These prices are taken from administration reports and the 'Bombay Government Gazette.')

In Bengal, the 'Calcutta Gazette' gives, for June, 1868, average good time, what are described for rice of cheapest sort, the "ordinary prices at this season," and what do we see? At Maunbhoom 50 seers or 100 lbs. for 1 rupee, and at Bancorah, 47 seers or 94 lbs. per rupee; while close by, at Singbhoom, it is only 20 seers or 40 lbs. for 1 rupee; at Patna, 13 seers or 26 lbs.; in the 24 Parrugnas, 16 seers or 32 lbs.

But there is another deplorable test.

Now, what better proof can you have than that when, in the year 1861, while British India exported to the United Kingdom alone, at the distance of thousands of miles, more than 3,000,000 cwt. of rice, at about 12*s.* a cwt. here, after paying all charges of freight, profits, &c., or at about 6*s.* to 8*s.* a cwt. at the ports of shipment; and to all parts of the world, grain worth 3,500,000*l.*, or say about 6,600,000 cwt., the North-West Provinces lost a quarter of a million of lives and immense property by famine.

In the year 1866, the United Kingdom imported above 2,000,000 cwt. of rice from British India, at about 6*s.* to 8*s.* a cwt. at the ports of shipment; and all parts of the world imported grain from British India worth 5,250,000*l.*, or say, above 10,000,000 cwt., while Orissa and Madras lost nearly a million of lives and millions worth of property.

Again, the last two years, Rajpootana lost a million of lives, says the Calcutta correspondent, on the authority of Rev. Mr. Robson, in 'The Times' of 27th December last, while the exports of rice to the United Kingdom has been 4,000,000 cwt. in 1868, and I think as much in 1869; and of grain to all parts of the world worth 2,600,000*l.*, or above 5,000,000 cwt. each year. Thus, in India, for want of proper communication, and therefore of easy distribution, famine destroys millions of lives and property. Good God, when will this end!

The question may be put by you, what it is I want to suggest. I ask, gentlemen, only for some good English common sense, both political and economical, that common sense which destroyed monopolies and corn-laws, upset the mercantile theory, and established free-trade; and I trust the desire of Englishmen, which is no less mine, and I believe of all educated and thinking natives, that British rule should endure long, would be fairly accomplished — a blessing to India and a benefit to England. Like the causes, the remedies I wish to be applied are also moral and material. About the moral remedies, the statement I have already made of the causes suggests also the remedies. There are, Sir John Shore said eighty years ago, certain "evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion;" and I say that these evils must be counteracted if that foreign dominion is to endure, and be based on the contentment and loyalty of the people. These evils can be stated in four words, "material and moral drain." The first I have already shown to be at present 12,000,000*l.* a year. The moral one is that of the wisdom of administration brought over to this country on the retirement of every English official, to whom alone both practical legislation and higher administration are chiefly confined. These two drawbacks political

common sense requires should be remedied, or the people cannot be satisfied. It is no use thwarting nature, however strong your arm may be. Nature will avenge every departure from truth and justice. Thus simply touching on the moral remedies, I come at once to the material ones. The very first question suggests itself, Why should India have to remit 12,000,000*l.* a year to this country? This, to a certain extent, is inevitable. If India is to be regenerated by England, India must make up its mind to pay the price. The only thing I have to say is, that England, on its part also, should act justly towards India; the financial relations between the two countries should be equitably adjusted. No unreasonable burdens should be imposed on India because it is at your mercy; and the revenues of India should be administered with economy, wisdom, and the sense of responsibility of a great trust. I appeal to the conscience of English statesmen and thinkers to give a careful consideration to this subject. Here, however, I must leave this point, hoping that England will do justice to India in this matter.

The other, and still more important material remedies, I must discuss at some length, as falling within the province of this Society. It is again a little economical common sense that is required. The most obvious remedy for the very poor production of the country, and its extra-political wants, is to increase production and facilitate distribution. It is no discovery of mine. Irrigation to increase production, and cheap communication are the crying wants of a country like India. These re-act upon each other. Irrigation will supply traffic for communication. Cheap communication will re-act by stimulating production, opening up new markets, and equalizing distribution. This certainly sounds very common-place, and an oft-told tale, but it is this common-place remedy upon which the material salvation of India depends, and it cannot be told too often till it is accomplished. Well, you may say the Indian Government don't deny this. I grant they are as loud in their acknowledgment of this necessity as anyone else. Then where is the hitch? That is just the question.

In order to avoid confusion and save time, I give you at once my own views, without entering into a discussion of the present policy of Government. The expenditure on public works may be divided into two sorts—on repairs and on original works. For repairs, by all means pay from the revenue, for it would be unjust to saddle posterity with any debt for them. The "original works" are divided by Government into "ordinary" and "extraordinary." Ordinary are those which do not pay directly, such as barracks, buildings for civil administrations, and common roads. These do not bring direct returns certainly, like railways, but repay indirectly, in the saving in rent, and in many other ways.

Now, nobody will contend that these works are only useful for the day, and that posterity, or even one or two generations after the present can have no interest in them. Is it just, then, not to say anything of the want of economical common sense, that the present generation, so little able to bear the burden, should be pressed to furnish the whole means, without any distribution of the burden with the next one or two generations? I maintain that Government should adopt the just as well as the economical policy of distributing the burden of these ordinary works

over say fifty years or two generations by means of terminable loans. By adopting this policy, the other most injurious effects of stopping works from time to time, according to the condition of the revenue, will be avoided. What is of the utmost importance is, that these works once decided upon should be carried out vigorously, and completed as soon as possible. I repeat, then, that I ask for only common sense in this matter. When a large load is to be raised, a common, unintelligent labourer tries to raise it directly by his hands, an intelligent labourer tries a lever, and a man of knowledge uses a system of pulleys or some machinery. What is the whole secret or aim of all mechanical science? Simply to distribute weight. Use, I say, the same common sense in financial matters. Use suitable financial machinery, and distribute the weight. Don't waste time, energy, and means in trying to raise the heavy load directly.

It looks almost ridiculous before an English audience to insist on this, but the Indian Government somehow or other does not do this. The mischief of this policy of making revenue pay at once for the ordinary original works is threefold—uncertainty, delay, and the consequent waste in the works themselves; the intolerable pressure of taxation upon the people, and their dissatisfaction; and lastly, what is still worse, the withdrawal of so much capital, which at present is very dear, and insufficient for the ordinary wants of the production and commerce of the country, Government using capital worth 9 per cent. and upwards, when it can easily get the same for 4 or 5 per cent., causing thereby to a poor country like India a serious loss, and shutting out England from safe investments in a country which is under its own control. Paying for these ordinary works from revenue, or from terminable loans, makes the whole difference to the people between being crushed by a load or carrying it with the greatest ease. It must be also borne in mind that any increase in the communications of the country, and the better attention to the wants of the country, will make the future generation better able to bear greater burdens than the present.

I next come to extraordinary public works, such as railroads, irrigation works, canals, &c. In the case of these works, Government has fortunately adopted the policy of borrowing; but somehow or other, there is some hesitation in going vigorously and boldly into the matter.

The hesitation for borrowing is grounded mainly, as far as I can make out, on one reason. It is said England's tenure in India is uncertain, and that if, after England lent a large sum, she should have to leave India, she may lose her loans. This is a very fair question, and must be fairly discussed. Now what is the best guarantee the English can have? As a native of India, I may answer, the loyalty and affection of the people. But as Englishmen, you may say, "Well, we fully appreciate loyalty and gratitude; but after all, it will not be prudent to depend upon that guarantee alone." Well, then, I ask, what is the best thing you can have? Can you have anything surer than a sufficiently strong English army? And if by the same policy which may enable you to have a strong army, you can also secure the loyalty and gratitude of the people, how much more will your security be increased. How can you have a sufficiently large English army without a sufficiently large revenue, and how can you have a large revenue unless the people are able to pay

it, and pay it without feeling crushed by it? If, on the one hand, the present political drain continues, and the country is not helped to develop its resources, the result is evident. The people must get poor, and revenue must diminish. If revenue must diminish, you cannot provide for a sufficient military expenditure, the guarantee for your rule is impaired, and still more so by the discontent of the people. On the other hand, if the Government went boldly and vigorously into the prosecution of all necessary public works by sufficient cheap loans, the production and commerce of the country and the ability of the people to pay taxes will increase, Government will be able to raise with ease larger revenue, and will be able to keep up the necessary strength of the army, the security by which will be further enhanced a hundredfold by the contentment and loyalty of the people.

The most absolute wants of any country, in the undeveloped condition of India, are irrigation and railroads, canals, and other cheap communications. Even now, the only or chief bright spot in the administration of the past fifteen years, for which Government claims, and justly receives, the greatest credit, for which India is most thankful to the English public, and which has opened a hopeful day for it, is, even with all the waste and jobbery, the railways, canal, and irrigation works already built by English loans. I beseech, therefore, that Government should pursue with vigour this hopeful path, for on this alone do the material salvation of India, and the strength and benefit of English rule depend. There is one more question in connection with loans which requires a fair discussion. It is the opinion of many that the loans should be raised in India. The reasons assigned are, either the fear of uncertain tenure of English rule, or that India may not have to remit interest to this country. The first, I have already answered, is suicidal. With regard to the second reason, I say, if India is able, by all means raise the loans there. I am very glad that Government have succeeded in inducing some of the native princes to lend money to build railways. But I have shown you already that India does not at present produce enough for its ordinary wants, much less can it save or spare capital for these loans. The very fact that capital is worth 9 per cent. ordinary interest in India shows its insufficiency, even for its very limited commerce.

The idea of making India raise loans is like ordering water to run up a hill. Raise loans in India, the result will be still the same. Water will gravitate to the lowest level. Beyond a certain amount needed in India for investments of trusts, retired persons, banks, unenterprising zemindars, &c., the rest will be bought up by this country. Be this as it may, the test is a very easy one. Let Government open loans at 4 per cent., both in India and England, at the best prices capitalists would give for this interest, and in such a way that the notes be easily negotiable both in India and England, and that the interest may be also obtainable in both countries without unnecessary trouble; and the natural laws of capital will settle the rest. If the English public have confidence enough, and if the 4 per cent. sterling loan is now at a premium, why should the Indian Government not allow India the benefit of these loans, and the capitalists of England an investment under the control of the British themselves? It is said that if Government resorted to loans,

the future debt of India would be very large. But why such should be the case I cannot understand. As to the ordinary works, the very fact of terminable loans means contributions from the revenue, and limit to the duration of the loan, the great advantages being "distribution of weight." With regard to extraordinary works, they are paying works, and even if they fail in paying the whole interest, the prosperity of the country will easily yield increased resource to make up for any deficit of interest. All progressing countries are building their public works by loans, and come to this country for borrowing, while poor India, with all her material and moral drawbacks, and struggling for her very existence, is tortured by all sorts of vexatious local and imperial cesses and taxes.

When I ask Government to build the works vigorously themselves, I should not be misunderstood as being in any way against true private enterprise; in fact, the principal articles of present export, except cotton and rice, owe their production mostly to English private enterprise. Who are the producers of the greater part of tea, coffee, indigo, silk, &c., and even in the case of cotton, how much is owing to Manchester constantly knocking at the door of the India House to build roads, canals, &c.? If English capital is encouraged in a reasonable manner, to open up new sources of production, what great benefit may be the consequence, both to England and India. England's benefit would be double; the profits of the investors will ultimately come over here, and consumption of British manufactures will be extended, with the greater ability of the natives to purchase them. The administration reports of the different governments give us figures of many millions of acres of culturable waste land. If Government only did the ordinary duty of opening up these lands by providing necessary communication, and, wherever practicable, necessary irrigation, what a vast store of treasure would be brought out, and what prosperity bestowed upon poor India.

Natives also would do a great deal, if properly guided and encouraged. I am afraid encouraging natives to look out does not seem to be much in the line of officials. I know of an instance, in which one Mr. Rustomjee Bomanjee, a Parsee of Bombay, has been running about for two years from collector to commissioner, and from one official to another, to be allowed to undertake, on his own account, an irrigation project near his property in Bassein, without, I fear, any result. I do not know whether anything has been lately decided. I don't wish to blame anybody. I cannot say what Government's ideas in the matter may be, but such dancing as this persevering gentleman has had is, I think, sufficient to discourage anybody. Moreover, scanty, if any, encouragement is given to natives to enter the engineering service.

I would just sum up the remedies I have been discussing in a few words of Lord Lawrence, as Commissioner of Punjaub, and which are quite as applicable now for all India:—"Let means of export, the grand desideratum, be once supplied, everything will follow. . . . Then money will be abundant, prices will recover their standard, and the land revenue will flourish."*

Before finishing the discussion of these remedies, I must urge one on

* 'Select Government of India,' No. xviii., p. 30.

the English public, which I sincerely believe to be an important one. The great misfortune of India, and consequently a great loss to England also, is that its real condition is not known here, and very little cared for. Every institution in this country has its independent body or society to watch its interest; for India, also, some such machinery is absolutely necessary. The India Reform Society, under the leadership of Mr. Bright, aided by the exertions of Mr. J. Dickinson and others, did at one time good service. Latterly, the East India Association has been formed for this purpose. I think it very essential, if England is to derive the full benefit of its Indian Empire, and be at the same time a blessing to it, that this East India Association, or some such body, whose object is to make India better known here, and to watch all Indian and English interests, be well supported by the English public. The result of my fifteen years' observation in this country is, that some such institution is absolutely necessary, or England cannot do its duty to India, and poor India must continue to suffer from the want of an independent watchfulness of the administration over it. I can only appeal to the existence of this very Society, and of many others, without which I do not know how much good would have remained undone, and how much mischief would have continued unchecked. At present the want of unity among the different interests produces its usual consequences of weakness and failure. As each interest, such as tea, or coffee, or cotton, or manufacturers, planters, commercial, civil or military, or any other, English or native, attacks the India Office in its small detachment, it is easily repulsed. But should all these interests combine together, and with the strength of the union of a powerful body, propose well-considered measures calculated to be beneficial to all interests, the India Office, less able to resist such action, will most probably welcome it to aid in its administration, and Parliament will be better guided in any efforts it may make, from time to time, to do its duty to India.

Now, gentlemen, whatever attention you may think my address worth, I am sure that on one point we should all agree,—that the subject of the commerce of India is one of those most important ones for the attention of the English public, whether for duty to India or for their own interest. You are aware that the East India Association has resolved to petition for a select committee of Parliament, and that Mr. Fawcett, having last session moved for a committee, the Right Hon. the Prime Minister has shown a disposition to be favourable to the motion when made this session. I sincerely trust the Council of the Society, in the way that may seem most suitable to them, will help in asking for the committee, and in getting it to institute a searching inquiry into the great questions why India's commerce is so miserably small, and not commensurate with its vast resources, extent, and population. Is it correct or not that the total production of the country is, with all the progress said to be made, yet so wretched as 1*s.* 6*d.*, or say even 2*s.*, per week per head; and, if so, is such a state of affairs creditable to British administration? Are the British rulers practically adopting a policy which would justify their declarations in the report of the material and moral progress for 1868–69, that "the State has now publicly announced its responsibility for the life of the least of its subjects," or the noble sentiment expressed by

Lord Mayo, "The coils that she (England) seeks to entwine are no iron fetters, but the golden chains of affection and of peace"? Will the next ten years be free from the heartrending, destructive famines of the past decade; and cannot the people of India be rendered so contented and loyal as to make Russia's ambition for the conquest of India a mere dream to be laughed at?

In submitting my views at present, and asking the help of this powerful Society in obtaining and utilizing the select committee, nothing is further from my mind than any hostile feeling to the Indian Government both at home and in India. I only desire to see the right administration of the country, and I wish to point out that, just like all the interests of this country itself, those of India also require intelligent, independent investigation by select committees of Parliament at reasonable intervals, and the watchfulness of some independent, well-organized body. The Prime Minister himself has given the strongest reason last session:—"And the fact, which we must all deplore, that it is not easy to secure adequate attention within these walls to Indian affairs, is an additional reason for having a committee to inquire into the matter."

It is, gentlemen, my deep conviction that the future elevation of the 200,000,000 of the people of India cannot be in better hands than those of the British nation. I only beseech you to do the good which is in your power, both to yourselves and to India, crowned with the blessings of a sixth of the human race.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. ANDREW CASSELS said the very earnest speech which had just been delivered by so intelligent a native of India, who, to the well-known sagacity of his race in all matters connected with trade, unites the experience gained during fifteen years' residence in this country, deserved the greatest attention; and he very cordially agreed with him upon many points, deploring, with him, the ignorance that was still so prevalent in England respecting India, and the little interest taken in Indian subjects by those who ought to lead public opinion, as might be seen by the way in which the benches of the House of Commons were deserted when any subject affecting our Eastern Empire was brought before Parliament. Some fallacies had been pointed out in certain returns laid before Parliament, some years ago, by Mr. Melville. It was, of course, impossible, speaking without book, to check the figures given; but that there were periods when the exports from India largely exceeded the imports, was proved, he thought, by the fact, which was very strongly impressed upon his mind, that during the ten years ending in April, 1866, the imports of bullion into India amounted, in round numbers, to 180 millions sterling. He presumed, however, that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's object in drawing attention to these figures was to establish the fact that England drew a large sum annually from India without making any tangible return, and that India was thereby impoverished; and this was, no doubt, a fact upon

which a great deal of misapprehension existed. But what had England and Englishmen done in return? They had given India security of life and property, civilization, and the blessings of what, with all its defects, must be called a good government. Even in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's own time, how much had been done! Remember the lawlessness and misrule that prevailed in Oudh, the Punjaub, and Scinde twenty-five years ago. Even if the amount drawn by England from India could correctly be called a tribute, then he would say never before had a conqueror made so great a return to a land gained by conquest. He quite agreed with what had been said about the expenditure on public works, and had lost no opportunity, public or private, of stating his opinion, that the policy of paying for even what were called ordinary works out of revenue was a mistake. It was not fair and just that barracks, buildings for civil administration, and common roads, which would benefit coming generations, should be entirely paid for by the taxpayers of to-day. It would be much more equitable that the cost of these works should be spread over a certain number of years, and be paid by terminable loans. During the last few years, there had been deficits on the Indian budgets amounting to upwards of six millions sterling, but of these, three-and-a-half millions could be accounted for by the expenditure on barracks alone. In order to cover these deficits of our own creation, the people of India were exasperated by the imposition of unnecessary taxes, especially an income-tax (the most odious of all taxes in their sight) equivalent to 7*d.* in the pound sterling. At the same time, the army was cut down to such a low state, that in any time of danger uneasiness was created. Many useful works could not be undertaken. At the same time, while everyone must see the policy of encouraging the cultivation of agricultural products in India, export duties were still retained, which in principle were altogether indefensible. Again, it had been truly said that loans should be raised in England as well as in India; and it certainly seemed very strange that semi-bankrupt States, like Turkey and Egypt, should get money from this country, that we should lend to States whose chronic condition was one of revolution, like Peru, and yet we should virtually shut out our own great Eastern Empire from the market. If the reason were, as had been stated, the fear that India would one day be lost, and that when that evil day came the less we had to lose the better, all he had to say was, that the present system was best calculated to bring about the very consummation which was dreaded. He could not refrain from expressing his regret that the Secretary of State did so little for Indian trade; for instance, for the last two or three years Lancashire had been urging upon Government the expediency of appointing a Board of Agriculture in India, and it was believed the thing would have been done —but it had not been done. Half-a-dozen under-gardeners had been sent out from Kew, and that effort seems to have exhausted the energies of the Indian Board for the time. Yet it was very necessary to encourage production in India in every possible way, even considering only the pounds, shillings, and pence side of the question. At present, the imports of India about equalled the exports, and the consequence was that the rate of exchange had fallen between the two countries to what might be called a bullion rate: and, bearing in mind that the Secretary of State

for India had to draw largely on India, the drawings in 1870 amounting to no less a sum than nine millions sterling, and that many persons in the services and in trade in India had to make large remittances to this country, and that every fall of a farthing in the rate of exchange represented a loss of 1 per cent. to the State, on the one hand, and to private remitters, on the other, it would be seen at once how very desirable it was that everything possible should be done to keep the exports of India in excess of her imports. Attention had also been drawn to the very distressing fact, that while one part of India was exporting rice to Europe, in another portion of the empire hundreds of thousands were starving. This was, no doubt, most distressing, but he did not quite understand whether Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji desired that Government should prohibit the exportation of rice. If so, he had been studying political economy in a very old-world school. Of course, what was required was to open up communication thoroughly by means of roads and railways, and a good deal had been done lately in that way. When all obstacles to trade were removed, demand would bring forward supplies of food before the point of actual want was reached. It must not be forgotten that the revenue at present drawn from the duty on opium, amounting to between 6,000,000*l.* and 7,000,000*l.* sterling, was a most precarious one, and might one day fail us altogether; and he could not help thinking that England had treated this question unwisely. It seemed to him the high duties levied on the drug represented an unworthy compromise between our sense of what was morally wrong and a care for material interests. England ought to wash her hands of the opium trade altogether, if she came to the conclusion that it was morally wrong to touch it; but, on the other hand, if she did not come to that conclusion, the duties ought to be lowered, and the cultivation of it encouraged, so as to discourage the growth of the poppy in China. He did not see why it should be treated in a different way to any other agricultural produce, especially as it appeared to him, speaking generally, that the baneful influence of opium lay in the abuse and not in the use of the drug. However that might be, this question would some day press itself very seriously on the public attention. Again, he could not help thinking, from statements which reached him from India, that the day was not far distant when it would be found necessary, in the interests both of the State and of the people, to inquire into the present position of the so-called "perpetual settlement" in Bengal, with a view either to repurchasing the rights of the zemindars, or to devise means of making them contribute much more largely than they did at present to the necessities of the State. It was a great mistake that, made by Lord Cornwallis eighty years ago. There were now very often three or four middle-men between the zemindars and the wretched cultivator of the soil, each one screwing a profit out of the land, which produced a rent of four or five millions sterling only to the Government, whereas it ought to produce fifteen or sixteen millions. He would not do more than allude to this subject on such an occasion, but it seemed to him that the only thing to be looked to in India in future to support the revenue was that which could be obtained most equitably and fairly from the land. An Indian Association had been suggested, which would, no doubt, do a deal of good; but

it was in Parliament that the cause of India had to be defended; and he had often wished that the electors in Lancashire, a county which was so largely interested in India, would make it a *sine quâ non* with their representatives that they should attend to Indian affairs.

Mr. HYDE CLARKE said it must have been with great pleasure that the meeting had witnessed that evening, almost for the first time, a native of India pleading the cause of that country, not in one of its own languages, but in a foreign language, although with such ability that he had already touched the hearts of his audience. Still, that was only the greater reason why more caution should be exercised in discussing the subject. They had heard that India wanted advocates, but how could this be said when she had an advocate so eloquent as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji himself, exercising an advocacy which his ancestors could never have done, even in India itself—an advocacy which would not be without its impression on the people of England nor on those of India. What he had said, however, must be carefully and calmly weighed, in order that it might exercise a good and not an evil influence on the interests of India. It might be so weighed in England, but what influence would such a discourse exercise when it reached India? The paper was professedly on the commerce of India, but it was really a discussion on the government of India, and the benefit which the natives of India received from it. On such a subject public attention ought not to be drawn away by the eloquence of the speaker, who had, amongst other things, remarked that when the people of this country were roaming about as naked savages, India was in a state of civilization. That was a mere rhetorical phrase. It might or might not be in the pages of history, for anything he or anybody knew, that at a time in long past ages, when England was in a high state of civilization, the population of India was in a state of savagedom; but without revelling in the realms of imagination, the two countries must be looked at as they were at present. In England the savages were few, but the hills and plains of India teemed with savages, kept in a state of barbarism by the oppression of the natives of India themselves, but they were being liberated from that barbarism and raised in the scale of civilization by the exertions of Englishmen. He would ask the Chairman, as one of the administrators of that great country, to bear testimony to what had taken place under his own eyes, where the people, whose ancestors were in a savage state, were being raised up to take a position side by side with their friend who had just addressed them, to exercise the same noble advocacy. Under these circumstances the public mind must not be led astray, but must look to the known facts upon the subject. He would not then quarrel with the figures which had been laid before them, although unfortunately the tables from which they were taken had not been given, but simply the broad results, which were very liable to mislead. A great deal had been heard about dates and figures during seventy years, and what the quantity of silver imported into India during seventy years amounted to, *viz.* 34*s.* per head. That was spoken of as a very appalling figure, and it was intimated that through some defect in the Indian government the natives were in that condition. But what was the population on which that average had been taken; and how had the silver and other bullion been distri-

buted in that time? In a short period, ending in 1866, no less than 180 millions, as had been stated by Mr. Cassels, were imported into India, showing therefore that this mass of figures ought to be separated from that long beadroll which had been referred to, in order to ascertain its actual bearing upon this subject. Such figures could not be followed in an oral discussion, hardly even when they were in print before one, and when these figures come to be thoroughly examined, it would, he believed, be found not to bear out the inferences which had been drawn from them; for, after all, there were certain broad tests on questions of this kind which must be conclusive. For instance, he would call attention to the state of affairs nearer home, which illustrated the case. The inequalities had been spoken of, and the very depressed state of the population, and it had been intimated that India was going to ruin. They had heard the same thing with regard to Ireland, and he (Mr. Clarke) had been forcibly struck with the resemblance between India and Ireland in some respects. It had been stated that the average wages in India was about 3*d.* per day, but, even within his own time, the rate of wages in Ireland was only 4*d.* or 5*d.* per day; but, notwithstanding that, Ireland had been advancing within the last few years, and India itself was also advancing. No doubt there were the inequalities that had been spoken of, but they arose from the very reason assigned, *viz.* that in some parts, where communication had been carried out, and large operations had been conducted, the rate of wages had risen, while in other parts they were stationary. Of course, it must be so in the nature of things; and the broad question to be considered was, What was the condition of India? and on this broad question of political economy it appeared to him that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's skill had, to some extent, failed him, through having omitted some elements of the question. In truth, for the purpose of his paper, he had treated this as a simple commercial matter—a question of imports and exports of India—stating that the exports were larger than the imports, and intimating that India expended at least ten millions a year, with no benefit to itself; but he had here mixed up the question of commerce with that of political results, and in political arithmetic 2 and 2 did not always make 4. He had intimated that this ten or twelve millions went in utter waste. On the one side he had put down so much cotton spun by English hands, so much manufactures produced by England and English intelligence, but he did not give credit to this country for that very portion of the expenditure which had been spent on military purposes of which he spoke. That was as pure a result of the hand-labour of this country for the benefit of India as any number of million yards of cotton goods that could be supplied. Nay, it was more, for India might supply itself with these textile fabrics, but it was England alone, as he had himself confessed, that could maintain the balance between the different races of India, and enable them to persevere in the course of advancement and civilization in which they were maintained by this country. We were bound, therefore, to put down this blood and bone, contributed for the service of India, as a most important item in the account; but there was another item, and that was the brain furnished to India, in the persons of those great statesmen to whom so high a tribute had been paid. After

all, therefore, the result was one of the progress of India. If, for instance, we went back to any former period, say 100 years ago, it would be found that the exports and imports at that time bore a very small proportion to their present amounts; and although many of the natives of India were in a state of great degradation and bitter poverty, their general condition must have been advancing during that period. The natives of India were spoken of as if they were suffering from some common cause, and attention being called to these woful instances of famine, a picture had been drawn at which he was surprised. Had any Englishman used the words which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji had used he should not have been astonished; but that one of the most intelligent teachers of India should put before a meeting such a picture, stating that rice was exported largely from Burmah, while at the same time other portions of India were suffering from famine, implying a great charge against this country, was something like a mistake which a very slight acquaintance with geography would be enough to correct. India, like Europe, contained countries widely separated from each other, and what had been referred to was no more than had taken place in Europe, and was actually taking place at this moment, for there were portions of France now suffering from the direst famine, whilst other portions of Europe were exporting grain. Means of distribution might be wanted, and they would have to be provided, but England was not to be taxed with the death of these natives as altogether arising from the method of its government. An appeal had been made to the common sense of Englishmen, and that no doubt must be exercised, but not in the manner which had been suggested, *viz.* a transfer of the government of India to the natives, for that was what it amounted to. Before this was done it must be proved, not that there were such defects in India as had been pointed out, but that 100 or 200 years ago the whole of India was in a state of great prosperity, that the condition of each native was much better than at present, and that India was one great model republic, like the United States, with the citizens exercising all the functions of government, and fully competent to carry them out. That was one of the cardinal mistakes which had been made. India was not England, and although there were some native gentlemen, like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the condition of the great mass of the people must not be forgotten. It really only did mischief to the advancement of India to suggest topics to them which they were incapable of considering as a body; and although they might be very well discussed by men of intelligence and enlightenment, they were calculated to create disaffection and disappointment amongst the natives of India. This therefore answered the remark of Mr. Cassels that Europeans were more generally disposed to lend their money to countries even in a chronic state of revolution than to India. The question lay entirely with the natives of India. The more they proved the permanence of the system of government under English leadership, but which was really being carried out by native intelligence, the greater would be the amount of capital, which it was said could not be obtained in India, but must come from Europe. He would therefore call the attention of the author of the paper to the political remedy, not such as he supposed, of handing over the government direct to the natives of India, but the improving of the municipal

organization, and so to gradually do what the Government of India was doing—educating the natives, and bringing them forward step by step; but for that purpose it was necessary that the intellectual gifts of a man like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji should be employed, not in promoting political agitation—which, though a great instrument in England, would be a very dangerous one in India—but in promoting the moral and social improvement of the people.

Mr. VESEY FITZGERALD said that, whatever might be the comparative advances made in civilization by England and India in years gone by, in those ancient times both countries were destitute of the resources and appliances of modern civilization, regard being had either to physical and material agencies, or to financial administration. With regard to material progress in India, there was no doubt that much had been already done, and that more would be accomplished, although the amount and extent of the improvement would depend upon various eventualities, which he would not then speculate upon. He might say, however, that the East Indian Irrigation Company stopped the progress of the Orissa famine wherever its works were carried out, and human life had thus been saved to a considerable extent, a fact to which he looked back with the most unmixed satisfaction, for he believed there was no moral or religious duty more incumbent on all connected with India than to put a stop to these horrible famines. Government had now purchased the works of the company, since which time, he believed, not much had been done in extending them, but still they existed, and that was something, though a mere trifle compared with what might be done by an extension of these irrigation works throughout the country.

Mr. EASTWICK, M.P., said he did not intend to throw any light on the controversy which had sprung up, in the first place because he was unable to settle it, and next, because he would not if he could, since it might serve to accomplish the great object in view, that of calling the attention of Parliament to the affairs of India. He was not at all sanguine that Parliament would succeed in solving the problem, but, at any rate, they would awaken public interest in the matter. He would, however, throw out one or two words of consolation to the author of the paper, who, naturally enough, was inclined to look upon the dark side of the picture. Even supposing it to be true that England was drawing 12,000,000*l.* annually from India, and returning very little to it, he was quite sure, from the examples to be found in history, that India would soon recover herself. Without going back to the old times, when gold, ivory, and peacocks were brought from India, he would only refer first to Madmoud, who carried off countless sums of money—hundreds of millions—if the accounts given were correct; but, nevertheless, not many years afterwards, India was again flourishing and full of wealth. The enormous wealth taken away in the time of Shah Jahom was a wonder to everyone, but that period passed, and after a time Nadir Shah was seen going away with innumerable possessions. He had seen the magnificent jewels in Persia, worth from 15,000,000*l.* to 20,000,000*l.*, the greater part of which were taken from Delhi. In spite, however, of the tremendous spoliation, India very soon recovered herself, and was now in a most flourishing condition. This was proved by the fact that prices had

risen, that public works were being spread over the country, and that the people were contented, notwithstanding the little trouble about the income-tax, which would soon pass away. With regard to lending out money in India for public works in a much more profuse way than had hitherto been adopted, he thought it a very questionable proceeding. If the works were remunerative, capital would naturally be attracted to that country; but on the contrary, if it were not attracted, and if the returns were not very great, it showed that much caution ought to be used.

Mr. KRISHNARAO DESHMUKH said, whilst he agreed that the growth of the raw products in India should be encouraged and stimulated, he was of opinion that something more in the shape of manufactures was needed, in order to give employment to the people and value to the natural productions of the country. Now, government in India was of a patriarchal character, being looked up to for everything that was required, and therefore he would suggest that something in the way of national schools of art and science should be established. It was also highly necessary that there should be better means of distributing the wealth of India, and for that purpose further means of communication were required. Now, public works of all kinds, as at present conducted, were very expensive, and consequently limited in amount, one reason of which was, that all the engineering superintendence had to be imported from Europe, at a great expense; and as the gentlemen who went there for this purpose had to run the risk of ruining their health by the climate, they, of course, required very high remuneration for their services. There was no reason, however, why natives should not be educated and trained as civil engineers; and he believed the Chairman would agree with him that they might find a legitimate field for their energies in that direction. Mr. Hyde Clarke and others seemed to think that the paper contained reflections on the Indian Government rather than on the commerce of the country, and that it was proposed that Government should prohibit the exportation of grain. He apprehended, however, that the object of the paper was merely to show the evils arising from want of communication between the different provinces, so that the produce of the country was diverted to different parts of the world rather than to the relief of its suffering and starving inhabitants.

Mr. BRIGGS proposed that the discussion should be adjourned, the subject being one of great importance.

Mr. W. TAYLER seconded the motion, especially as he believed the purpose and scope of the paper had been misunderstood by some gentlemen.

Mr. J. A. FRANKLIN supported the proposition, in order that the heavy indictment brought against the India Government might be answered.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the wishes of the meeting, the discussion would be adjourned to March 3rd, that being the earliest available day. For himself he could hardly look upon the paper as a bill of indictment, but rather considered it as bringing forward important facts bearing on a commercial question which it was peculiarly the province of such a Society to discuss. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji produced figures in which he conceived he had shown very clearly that, during a certain period of years, there had been a very large money

balance paid by India to England, and which might be considered either as the cost of good government to India, or as a tribute, but undoubtedly it was an annual payment by India to England. He did not imagine that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji intended in the least to complain of this burden, but rather to look upon it as a burden which India willingly bore for the great benefit which she received from England. Still, it was a matter of great importance, when dealing with a person on whom a benefit was conferred, and who had to pay an annual sum for that benefit, to know how that burden could be most easily borne, and that seemed to him a point which was peculiarly the province of the Society of Arts to discuss. As far as he knew, that point had never been brought prominently before the English public. It was brought forward originally by Sir George Wingate in one of his reports, but it had never been adequately discussed by Englishmen. In other countries, when facts of this sort, containing imputations of any kind on the Government, were brought forward, parties met in some dark hole and conspired together, and got up a revolution or rebellion; but it was one of the peculiar blessings of England that, instead of doing so, Englishmen met in a well-lighted room like this, and a number of practical men took the matter in hand, set to work to discuss it, and did not rest until they had settled the question whether the facts before them bore out the inferences which had been drawn. That, as he understood, was the course which the author of the paper wished to be pursued. That was how the corn-law question was dealt with. There were very few in that room probably who did not recollect the time when it was considered that some great benefit to somebody was derived from the corn-law, and it was not until after long discussion, and a great deal of argument and calculation, that people began to see that there were two sides to that question, and ultimately it had been settled, as most people believed now, in the right way. It was by means of associations in different parts of the country doing the same kind of work which that Society did in London, which converted the English mind and brought the country peaceably through that great revolution, and that was the sort of thing which was wanting in the present instance, so that it might really be seen whether India did pay a large tax to England for a great benefit, and whether this tax could in any way be levied in a more favourable manner. This was a question in which the Society could render most essential service to both countries. He was glad to be able to say that only that morning he had seen a sketch of a very large department of agriculture and commerce, which Lord Mayo had devised, and which he considered should do in India very much the kind of work which was done by the Board of Trade here; and he had no doubt that in a mail or two very full details would be seen of what that department was intended to do. He had also seen a letter within the last day or two from Colonel Rundell, in which he mentioned that 100,000 acres had this year been irrigated from the works in Orissa, commenced during the famine. And, in addition, it was stated that the port of False Point, which at that time was almost inaccessible, had now become of considerable importance. All this was due to the work done by Englishmen acting on intelligence derived from the intelligent natives of India, and these were the sort of agencies which he

believed Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji wished to see multiplied. In considering these questions, a map of India should always be at hand, when it would be seen that what appeared an immense amount of work, if applied to a country like England, was very little when applied to such an area as that of India. In conclusion, he moved a cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji for his valuable paper.

Mr. KAZI SHAHABUDIN seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. TAYLER said he believed one point in the paper which required discussion was the question whether the natives of India should not be more adequately represented in the Government. He hoped that would be considered by gentlemen intending to take part in the adjourned discussion.—(*Journal of the Society of Arts*, Feb. 17, 1871.)

MEETING AT THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1871,

For the adjourned Discussion on Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's Paper on "The Commerce of India."

SIR BARTLE FRERE, K.C.B., G.C.S.I., IN THE CHAIR.

THE CHAIRMAN said, since the adjournment he had had two or three notes from gentlemen who volunteered to defend the Government of India against what they conceived to be charges brought against it in the paper, but he believed the meeting generally would agree with him that this was not in the least necessary. No one could be more jealous than he himself of the good name of the Indian Government, but he considered that no charge requiring a defence was brought forward. There was simply a statement of facts, which admitted of being proved or disproved, and whatever might be the result of the discussion, it was one in which the Government of India above all ought to rejoice.

Mr. BRIGGS concurred with the opinion of some of the previous speakers that it was more like a bill of indictment against our Indian policy than an essay on the Commerce of India. Be this as it may, he was at a loss to know why it should not be so if it could be clearly shown that the Indian policy of our Government had been the great obstructor of India's progress and development. Why should the Government be left untold of their faults and shortcomings in respect to their Indian any more than that of home policy? This was no party question; it was one of life and death for the masses of the people of India, who number some two hundred millions—an empire which is said to be "the brightest gem in the British crown." If this saying be true, let us not refuse to rub it up and bring out its native dormant brilliancy. He would not dwell much on the author's preliminary figures, wherein he seems to differ from Mr. Melville on the question of some medium of exchange (silver). "Figures may be used to prove black was white," &c. How does he value the imports, to wit? Does he value them at the cost at which they are put on shore in India, or at the price

they realize when finally sold? He (Mr. Briggs) had reason for putting this question, of a painful nature. For instance, some nine or ten years ago he and others had subscribed some 70,000*l.*, which was spent principally in machinery, and sent over to India in order to help the natives in their efforts to bring out some of the dormant agricultural wealth. This machinery cost us about 70,000*l.*, and, in consequence of the rotten system of government, obstacles of every conceivable shape were interposed to the efforts made to building docks and bridges, make roads, and cultivate the soil. The result was that they gave up their efforts in disgust, and the machinery, &c., was sold, the whole stock, lock and barrel, for less than 18,000*l.* Now, what he wanted to know was whether the 18,000*l.* or the 70,000*l.* would be the official value for statistical figures? Again, we had more than once sent goods to India that had not realized cost price by some 20 to 50 per cent. He mentioned this merely to show that figures may be misleading. It might, however, also show to some extent the cause of India's want of progress. Mr. Naoroji divides his paper into three heads, *viz.*: "first—The Real Extent of the Commerce of India; second—The Reason why it is extremely Limited, notwithstanding the Progress it has, to some extent, made; third—What Suitable Remedies should be adopted for so unsatisfactory a state of things." He would take the first point as settled, and say a few words on the second and third. Suffice it to say that the real extent of India's commerce, like all other agricultural countries, must necessarily depend upon the surplus produce of her soil after feeding her own people. Second—As regards the reasons why it is so extremely limited, they are certainly various; but there is one question which underlies all the rest, and he regretted to find Mr. Dadabhai dwelt but slightly upon it. If he be unsound on this (the corner-stone to the whole fabric), he (Mr. Briggs) trembled for the regeneration of India through native representation; he need not say that that question is the "Waste Land Laws." He had said this repeatedly, and he did not shrink from repeating it here, that until a sound code of laws be passed for alienating the soil to the masses of the people, there would be no hope for India. Before you offer the people generally the power of self-government, first bind them to the soil in fee simple by this unerring bond of peace. They would then soon find a way to respect peace, law, and order; they would then have a powerful stimulus to patriotism, and they would then, and not till then, see that their own self-interest was bound up in that old but good proverb, "Honesty is the best policy." This is the key to the solution of the whole problem, morally, socially, materially, politically, and economically. Herein lies the secret of Lord Mayo's coils, that England seeks to entwine, the golden chain of affection and peace. What free trade in corn was for England, free trade in land would be for India. It is through this policy, and no other, that we may hope for Lord Lawrence's "grand desiderata, the means of export." It is through this policy that we shall find means for the execution of such works as railways, canals, irrigation, cheap transit generally, so that the means of distribution may be perfected. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji tells us that "the administration reports of the different Governments give us figures of many millions of acres of cultivated waste land," and goes

on to blame Government for not opening up those lands. Judging from the past history of our attempts to open up these, we see clearly that until the Land Laws alluded to be a fact accomplished, we may as well "call spirits from the vasty deep" as look to Government to do these beneficent works. Had Mr. Dadabhai left out one or two columns of his preliminary figures about silver (trash), and devoted the same space and labour in showing how many millions of acres, and in what locality, he would have done still better, though I have no fault to find barring this, for it is as well the question is brought before the public by a native of India. As regards the guarantee of the loyalty and affection of the people, I would submit that no better guarantee than this law, which enables the great mass of the people to become landowners in fee simple, by virtue of complying with the easy conditions of settling down, cultivating, and conforming to just laws of citizenship. To give an illustration corroborative of what I have advanced in favour of recognizing these wise land laws, which wed labour to the soil, and multiply its products fivefold, I would venture to draw your attention to a letter, copied from the 'Delhi Gazette' into 'The Asiatic' of the 24th ult. (January), from Mr. Login, who reports that he "had great pleasure in informing you the yield of my cotton experimental field was, up to the 10th inst. (Dec., 1870), no less than 247 lbs. of clean cotton per acre, or nearly five times the average rate of cotton fields grown on the native system during the whole season. As the gathering season lasts till the end of January, there still remains fifty days; and if the rate continues as it has done (nearly 5 lbs. an acre daily), this would give us nearly 250 lbs. more, or very nearly 500 lbs. per acre, as estimated by the natives when I prepared my report on the 21st October. Now, who is this Mr. Login? If it be the one who read a paper for this Association, I think he ought to be recognized at once as being the great pioneer to that mode of agriculture that will prove to be the only means for regenerating India. He has given us proof positive that the soil and climate, if properly treated, is capaple of from five to ten times its present yield per acre. In order to show the native mind what it gets for the ten or twelve millions a year, which they seem to grudge, let us take Mr. Login's estimate at the lowest point, to avoid exaggeration, at say five times the present average produce. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji puts the present value of the produce of the soil for all India at 80*s.* per annum per head of the population, or 4*l.*—that is, 200,000,000, at 4*l.* each, 800,000,000*l.* Now, if we multiply this by five, say 4,000,000,000*l.*, which is Mr. Login's estimate of what it would produce if properly treated, and which has been demonstrated by actual experience. Now, here is a profit sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man, or set of men, *i. e.* by an outlay of twelve millions a year for ruling India, there is a return of four thousand millions, or three thousand two hundred millions profit. It is true they may say we have never realized this yet; quite so, but whose fault is it? Here lies the "hitch." You had such men as Lord Canning, who had brains and moral courage enough to give you a sound code of laws respecting the alienation of waste lands. This was the foundation-stone, and had it been allowed to remain the law of the land, was worth to you at least, say one-half, or 2,000,000,000*l.* You

had such men as Major-General Sir A. Cotton, whose skill and honesty would have shown you how to facilitate distribution by means of steam-ship canals, and also to increase production by irrigation. This would have been worth to you another 1,000,000,000*l.* Then there are such men as Mr. Login, whom I have just been quoting, whose hydraulic engineering skill cannot be well surpassed. Utilize brains like these and you have the other 1,000,000,000*l.* to complete the four thousand millions alluded to. I leave out other names, inasmuch as I consider other statesmen who are concerned in the development of India to be accounted good, bad, or indifferent, according as they utilize by their legislation the brains of the above class of men. If our Society fail to recognize correctly cause and effect, how can it expect to enlist public sympathy and support; and failing the latter, we cannot expect to influence the Legislature to any great extent for good; and that we have not yet done so, I think sufficient evidence of it will be found in the fact that not only was the Queen's Speech destitute of any allusion to Indian matters, but that when the Indian Budget was brought before the House the other day, scarcely a score of M.P.'s were to be found at their post, and before the close of the Budget speech not more than ten remained to discuss it. Now, these are what I term the "heroic ten," who brave the moral and social scandal attached to patriotically and disinterestedly performing their duty to their country, regardless of party cry; and I would venture to suggest that their names, and also those of their constituents, be printed in letters of gold, in a memorial to be presented to those constituents, thanking them for having sent to Parliament such far-seeing and wise representatives.

Mr. Tayler said it must be a cause of great regret to all who took an interest in India, that some of the statements made by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in his very able paper, had been the cause of some misapprehension. He used the word "misapprehension," because he felt convinced that all who were acquainted with the able author would feel it was perfectly preposterous to impute to him any desire to exhibit disloyalty to the Government, or to raise any vexatious antagonism to the present authorities. Englishmen were apt to attribute to the natives rather a leaning to that over-subserviency to the powers that be which was disapproved of in this country. It was not therefore for an assembly of Englishmen to censure or disapprove of such a manly, frank, and independent declaration of opinion as that which was presented in the paper. He should be very sorry to think that the natives of India, many of whom would no doubt read the record of what had taken place, should be impressed with the idea that Englishmen condemned in others what they admired in themselves. He did not propose to enter into the delicate ethnological question of the amount of clothing the ancient Britons possessed at the time when India was in a state of high civilization; all he could say was that the practical question is not what the natives of India wore a thousand years ago, but what they wear *now;* and this he must confess was unpleasantly little, and the great question for them to consider was, how that little could be increased, for if each native of India at the present moment were to add only one small piece of cloth to his habiliments, it would be an exceedingly interesting fact to Manchester,

and would be a source of immense profit to English manufacturers. Statistics, of which he had the greatest abhorrence, were generally a most fruitful source of controversy: Mr. Cassels had disputed to a certain extent those cited in the paper. He thought there were some elements of confusion in those produced by Mr. Dadabhai. For instance, he considered it rather unnecessary to go back so far to those "bad times," as Mr. Gladstone called them, and to take an average of seventy years' imports. He thought a period embracing the last ten or twenty years would have been amply sufficient. However, the real point at issue was this—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's statement was, that the rule of England was a foreign rule, and that a foreign ruler takes from the subject kingdom a certain amount of money, under the name of tribute or something else; and taking this at ten or twelve millions, he said nothing was given in return in the shape of material, tangible money. He did not for a moment suppose that it was meant to imply that nothing at all in the shape of moral return was made, or that security to life and property, an immunity from external danger, a tolerable administration of justice, and the blessing of education to a certain extent, though not so great as it ought to be, had not been given to India. If anyone were to deny that, he need only point to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji himself as a signal illustration of the fact. The question was, Did England do her duty adequately to the people subject to her? What were the facts? After a century of struggle for supremacy, partly by honourable victory, partly by judicious treaty, partly by questionable intrigue, and partly by most unquestionable spoliation, the English nation had become at last the paramount power throughout the whole of British India. This was not to be disputed. Here, then, were two nations brought into contact, one strong in the strength of advanced civilization, of wealth, of situation, and of political power; the other weak in semi-barbarism, ignorance, and superstition. The two were brought together, and the weak nation was now under the dominion of the strong, and subject, he hoped willingly, but, certainly, without open resistance, to its power. These people possessed a country, one of the most magnificent in the creation, with noble mountains, glorious rivers, miles of cultivated fields, and unlimited capabilities of production, yielding everything man could wish to have or to enjoy; yet these 200 millions of people were weak, poor, and impoverished. In auspicious seasons they reaped, by their patient labour, a scanty subsistence; but if heaven denied them the early and the latter rains, they died in tens of thousands, and the whole land was whitened with their bones. Did the British Government fulfil its trust to these poor people? He must say, he thought it was a question more easy to ask than to answer. Of the glitter, pomp, and pride of outward circumstances there was enough, and more than enough. There was a covenanted and uncovenanted service, unequalled in the world; there were laws, which, though not always suited to the people, were sound in principle; there were courts, where justice was professedly administered; the Viceroy was a live lord, and scarlet and gold glittered around the Government House; the whole paraphernalia were dignified and appropriate; but in spite of all this, he feared that we had abused our trust, had neglected the poor, had paid far too much attention to the outside of the platter, and that whilst wash after wash of

meretricious plaster had been laid on the exterior of the sepulchre, the inside of it was full of unclean things, and too often, he feared, of dead men's bones. What was to be done? At this moment the middle classes, the native millionaires, and the salaried officials were uttering shrieks, as Mr. Grant Duff said, when any unwelcome taxation was imposed upon them, their voice was re-echoed through the press, and their cries were heard and attended to; but who was there to speak, who to agitate, who to think for the 200 millions of poor people who, according to 'The Times,' lived on 2*d.* a day, and required but a few rags to clothe them? Were those people adequately represented, and justly taxed? He would entreat those who had any interest in the councils of the empire, to impress it upon those at the head of affairs, that now, when a certain breathing time was allowed us, they ought to propose to themselves the question whether England was doing her duty to the great nation which was placed under her charge. For this purpose the great objects to be aimed at were, first of all, the increase of artificial irrigation, ensuring a supply of water, in India truly called the water of life; increased facilities of transit and locomotion, in order that the surplus produce of the land might be distributed; the release of the poor from the oppression of usurious money-lenders (which he was glad to see had already been initiated by Lord Mayo); the proper equalization of taxation, and the exemption of the lower classes from the duty on salt, their only luxury, or rather a necessary of life to those who live on vegetable diet—a necessary which is now taxed at the rate of 7 per cent. on their miserable earnings. In conclusion, he would repeat that the foundation of all successful administration in India, of all stability, and all financial success, might be summed up in this one sentence:—First the productiveness of the soil; secondly, the contentment of the people.

Mr. KAZI SHAHABUDIN said Mr. Hyde Clarke had complained at the previous meeting that although the title of the paper was "The Commerce of India," the discussion had been on the Government; but he seemed to have forgotten one great point, that in India all the results affecting the material and intellectual conditions of the people were traceable to the action and agency of the Government, contrary to what took place in England, where, if anything went wrong, the people themselves were to blame. In India, everything being done by the Government, it must both take the credit for what good it did, and also accept the blame for its shortcomings. Anyone taking up the trade returns, and analyzing them, would find an extraordinary state of things, *viz.* that the exports exceeded its imports by millions. This was a startling fact, because no country could be in a prosperous condition where it existed. He might illustrate it in this way: If a merchant in Bombay sent 100*l.* worth of goods to England, he must get back, not only his 100*l.*, but a profit to cover his expenses, and to support him. If he got only 92*l.* he could not say he was prospering, and the end would be that he must close his concern. Now, in the trade of India there were other items mixed up in the returns which were not commercial. To continue the same illustration: If the Bombay merchant had a friend in London, and sent to him saying he was in difficult circumstances, and his friend sent him a loan of 15*l.*, you could not call that a commercial export; it was no return

for goods sent, it was only a loan, which stood to the credit of his English friend, and must be repaid. In the same way, loans formed a large portion of Indian imports. Mr. Cassels said that India, in the ten years ending with 1866, imported 180,000,000*l.* of bullion, and so it was; but taking this fact apart from the whole of India's commerce, it was apt to give an erroneous impression. Persons not understanding the whole subject might suppose it was all imported and hoarded, that it was all profit, but he could see no difference between bullion and other merchandise. It was just like piece goods or hardware. Now, taking the ten years during which this amount of bullion was imported, the exports were, during that time, 438,000,000*l.*, and the imports, including the bullion, 405,000,000*l.* In these imports were included 101,000,000*l.* which were not commercial imports at all, but either debt contracted in England or money advanced for railways, and all this 101,000,000*l.* stood to the debit of India; thus, there was a balance against India of 134,000,000*l.* in ten years, or at the rate of about 13,000,000*l.* a year, which was the estimated transfer of wealth from India to England. Mr. Cassels also stated that of late years the exports and imports were nearly equal, but that exports from India must always be kept in excess of imports. He would only say that any student of political economy would agree with him, that neither India nor any other country could prosper if her exports were kept in excess of her imports to the amount of millions. If this were the case, he needed to be considerably enlightened. Now, the question would naturally arise, What must be the condition of a country, and what were the causes of this state of things? The question had been answered in two ways: one answer had been given by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and the other answer had been given by those opposed to him. They said that the present Government was a great improvement on the former state of things. He did not consider that an answer. It was a great mistake for anyone to suppose that the natives of India were not sensible of the benefits of English rule. Those who held this view did not do justice to his countrymen, or to the education given by the English Government, but a comparison with the former condition ought not to be any source of satisfaction. The same might be said of England. Notwithstanding all the improvements of modern times, the nation were still clamouring for more. His friend (Mr. Dadabhai), on the other hand, said the actual condition of the country was best estimated by ascertaining what it produced, and this he put at 40*s.* per head: adding 100 per cent. for opium, salt, and the produce of industry, his figures came to about 2*s.* per head of the population per week. His estimate of 40*s.* per head had been confirmed in Parliament by the Under Secretary of State for India. If any other confirmation were required, he would appeal to those who had passed through the country and lived among the people. The report submitted by a Government official in Madras stated that the masses of the population in that Presidency were paupers. Another proof was the cost of living in Government gaols, which, including clothing, was 3 rupees per month, and it was admitted that the diet given in gaols was not available for the masses. Again, Mr. Elliot, an officer in the North-Western Provinces, said the diet in the gaols was large and generous, and that half the agricultural population did not

know what it was to have their hunger fully satisfied. Bombay was the most flourishing Presidency, but the condition of the masses there, with which he was well acquainted, was not much better; in fact, the masses generally were no better than paupers. Very recently, Mr. Cave quoted the price of grain at Jubbulpoor, and inferred therefrom a high state of prosperity; but how many Jubbulpoors were there in India? There were hundreds of places not far off where grain was as cheap as anything could be, and the price of labour very low indeed, so that such an isolated instance was no criterion whatever.

Mr. MAITLAND thought the main question was, what could really be done for India, rather than whether all the details of figures given were absolutely correct. It was not his intention to defend the Government of India in every respect, but some statements had been made in the paper which, if they passed without comment, would, he believed, tend to produce effects which the writer would be the first to regret, for an over-statement was always a source of weakness. Now, in dealing with the commerce of India, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji had compared it, taking the computed value per head of population, with the exports and imports of English colonies in North America, Australia, and elsewhere; but it had been often said that figures would prove anything, and when statistics were given, it was of the utmost importance that correct deductions should be drawn from them, or they would do more harm than good. He contended that one might as well take as a comparison the empire of China. It had a very fertile soil, and one of the most hard-working and thrifty populations in the world. The country was of such vast extent, that it was impossible to say exactly what the population was, but it was estimated at from 300,000,000 to 350,000,000; and taking the exports of tea, silk, &c., that came from there, and dividing them by the number of the population, the result would be most astonishing. The fact was, that large parts of the empire of China were so far removed from the seaboard that it was quite impossible that they ever could export any quantity of produce. The country was so imbedded in Asia that it was not possible for large parts of the interior, however industrious the population, to do more than produce enough for themselves and their neighbours. And it was the same with India to a great extent. As he heard Mr. Grant Duff say the other evening, one great difficulty in governing India was, that with the revenue contributed by 150,000,000 of people you had to govern as well as possible, in a scientific and proper way, 200,000,000. The meaning of that was, that a large portion of the population were not producers; they were still in a state of whole or partial savagedom, and a large number were so far removed from the sea-coast that their bulky produce could never be exported. It was absurd, therefore, to draw a comparison between such a country and England, covered as it was with a network of railways, or with Australia, with a population of perhaps 2,000,000, every one of whom almost was a producer of something. An American would laugh at the idea of taking an average per head of exports of all the individuals subject to the United States Government, including the Red Indians; and on the same principle, only that portion of the population within reach of the seaboard ought to be taken into account. The same with regard to imports. It was said that Australia

imported goods to the value of 6*l.* per head, as against 2*s.* per head for India, but it must be remembered that from time immemorial India had been the seat of manufactures herself. He remembered the time when large quantities of piece goods came from India to England. It was useless, too, to go back so far as seventy years, especially when the statistics of a more recent period showed great improvements. In 1853, he went out to become a partner in a house in India, and he left in 1864, and during that time he witnessed remarkable changes, and the same had occurred between 1864 and the present time. He did not speak without knowledge, having had the honour to be President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, and a member of the Legislative Council of Bengal. He could say without hesitation, and would refer to any of his brother merchants in India to confirm the statement, that from 1853 to 1864, and again from 1864 to the present time, there had been an immense development of the commerce of India. He wished there were ten miles of railroad and canal for every one yet made, but still it was no use shutting one's eyes to what had been done during the past few years. Again, Mr. Naoroji had spoken of poor India being drained of its talent and brains, all the Government officials coming home after a time; but there was a constant succession of able men to replace those who left, and it was quite a mistake to suppose that those who had been in India, when they came home, forgot her, and took no interest in her welfare. The real question, however, was, what could be done to improve the condition of India? The scheme of decentralization was about to be brought into play, and no doubt the paper which the Chairman had read in that room a short time ago was not without its influence in that direction. Railways were extending, and one very satisfactory feature in the case was, that some of the native princes were coming forward to contribute funds for this purpose. Another thing which he much wished to see, and which, as far back as 1857, he had pressed upon the attention of the Indian Government, was the abolition of the export duties on articles of Indian produce, particularly those which had to compete with the produce of other countries. At all events, those duties should be very moderate, and not like the present high duty on rice. He believed this would now receive attention, for he noticed that Lord Mayo, in advocating the establishment of a Department of Agriculture for India, said he doubted whether, if such a department had existed, it would be possible to impose or maintain export duties on the staple products of the country. In conclusion, he hoped it would not go forth to the people of India that the House of Commons paid little or no attention to Indian affairs, for he was pleased to see what an improvement was being manifested in this respect, a much larger attendance than usual having marked the introduction of the Indian budget.

General Sir Arthur Cotton said he could not agree with the last speaker, that there were districts in China and India which must always be cut off from all foreign commerce, the fundamental fact in the question of foreign commerce being that every part of the world was accessible to every other part. It was simply necessary to make internal transit so cheap that anything could be conveyed almost any distance, and that was one of the most essential points of the present question: It was said

that there were parts of India inaccessible to the ocean, but this was the very point in dispute, and to say that they always must be so was begging the question. The Western States of America were completely cut off from the rest of the world; but now, by means of canals and rivers, they were brought into communication with the seaboard, and their produce was conveyed thousands of miles, and brought into competition in the markets of the world. It was a matter of unmixed satisfaction to him to see Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and other native gentlemen standing up, meeting Englishmen face to face, and discussing these questions; and he hoped other intelligent native gentlemen would come forward and do the same. There was, however, one main source of fallacy in almost every statement put forth with regard to India, and that was that the difference in the value of money was not taken account of. Now, this difference between England and India was at least three to one, and sometimes four to one, at the present moment; and when 2*s.* a head in India was spoken of in comparison with other places, it ought really to be 7*s.* or 8*s.* per head. If this fact was not kept in view, it falsified every inference. Again, as to going back seventy years, he thought we had quite sufficient to bear of our own sins without answering for those of our grandfathers, and the question was, what had been done during the last few years, and what was doing now? From 1858 to 1867, the import of bullion into India above the exports had been 164 millions, or about 16½ millions a year, and he submitted that that was a *bona fide* increase of wealth to India. No doubt, they had sent home the value of it, having sold produce beyond what was consumed for their own use, which had enabled them to import this amount of money. Then, when comparing the imports of British manufactures into India and into Australia, the 1*s.* 9*d.* per head in the former case must be multiplied by at least three, as he had before said, in order to make a fair comparison, and in the next place the difference of climate, and consequently the amount of clothing required, must be borne in mind. If all the natives of India had to clothe themselves in pea-jackets and warm trousers, there would, of course, be an immense increase in this respect. Some doubt had been thrown on the rise of prices in India, but it was a positive fact that the fall in the value of money during the last fifteen years was at least equal to two to one, and this was an immense boon to the natives in its bearing on the land-tax. Fifteen years ago, this tax was one rupee an acre, and it was the same now; but at the present moment they only had to sell half the produce to raise the tax as they formerly had. Mr. Tayler had touched upon one of the most important points when he said that there was no provision for hearing the voice of the masses of the people of India. That was the grand fundamental evil, for, in the present state of things, there was no possibility of their being heard. If a tax was imposed which affected the merchants, or the zemindars, or the planters, or if anything was done which affected the Government officials, there was no end of discussion about it, but a financier might lay a tax on the poor people's salt, and nobody said a word. That was a most terrible evil, and one which ought to be remedied. The slaves in America were never allowed to speak, nothing was heard of them, they had no representation, but the result was a concussion which shook the whole Union to its basis,

and ended in the destruction of half a million of people, and a debt of 400,000,000*l.* This was the simple result of treating the mass of the labouring classes with contempt and indifference. The masses of the people could not be left in this position with impunity. The case of the Orissa famine had also been mentioned, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji had been found fault with for complaining that rice had been exported from India whilst thousands were dying with famine. In his opinion, however, he was perfectly right, and that famine was one of the greatest blots that ever fell upon a nation. At the moment that hundreds of thousands were dying for want of food, 50,000 tons of rice were being sent away to England. Could anybody say that the Government could not have bought the cargoes, stopped those ships, brought them to Orissa, and discharged them there? How Europeans could have stood by and seen that awful calamity, and not bought one shipload of rice to save the lives was most astounding in his eyes. It was no use ignoring this lamentable fact. While agreeing that the country was in a state of impoverishment, such as ought not to be, he at the same time agreed that there had been a very great improvement made, and that things were now vastly improving. The main point was to increase the production and cheaper transit. A late leader in 'The Times' said:—"A country rich in roads, harbours, arsenals, and stores, in other words provided liberally with all but water, possesses in reality a public fortune. Why is India, notwithstanding its fabulous reputation, one of the poorest countries in the world? Because it is in want of highways, ports, navigable rivers, systems of irrigation, and arrangements for developing its agricultural and mineral wealth. With good communications, easy means of transport, and a fertile soil, accumulated materials, and an industrious population, a country must needs be wealthy. France was a wealthy nation, because for ages past her rulers had devoted themselves to the creation of these modes of communication, which rendered available her productive soil and the efforts of her industrious population." At the present moment there were in India twelve vast works of irrigation on hand, which if completed would irrigate fifteen millions of acres, produce sixty millions' worth a year of produce, and give 15,000 miles of cheap transit, and nothing was wanted but to push them on. He was sorry to say, however, that as soon as the East Indian irrigation works were purchased by the Government they were immediately stopped, though they were in a forward state of completion. He could not conceive a greater blunder.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in replying, said he felt exceedingly thankful for the way in which his paper had been received and discussed; and, notwithstanding that some few remarks had been made, as was supposed, in opposition to his views, he could not but congratulate himself that his main points had been maintained and developed much more forcibly by other speakers than by himself. He had, however, been, in one or two instances, slightly misunderstood, as he would endeavour to explain. He had purposely avoided drawing any comparison between the past and present, and had introduced the statistics showing the excess of exports over imports merely to show how fallacious were the statements sometimes put forth on the highest authority; and although this was, no doubt, unintentional, it was none the less misleading. In a question of

commerce, in which figures were the basis of the whole argument, it was absolutely essential that they should be accurate, and he must therefore be excused for saying that a great deal more care than was usually given was required in drawing conclusions from the statistics to which he had referred. He had never denied that some progress had been made during the last fifteen years, but upon this point also he would venture to use the following illustration :—A strong man knocked down a weaker one, and, to use the words of Mr. Grant Duff, almost ground him to dust, and then, after giving him a glass of water to revive him, said, "See how I have benefited you ; I have given you a good glass of water, and now you are ever so much better." Down to 1850,* India was being continually impoverished, and then the Government themselves, being aghast at the results, began to look about to see what could be done. They soon struck upon the right path, which was, to send back to India the wealth which had been drained from her during seventy years, to the extent of hundreds of millions. 100,000,000*l.* had been lent for the purpose of constructing railways, but this was not enough. England had drawn from India twenty times as much as she had yet lent her. He did not claim that it should be returned, he simply asked for a loan of so much money as would enable India to supply herself with necessary public works, and it should all be repaid, with a thousand thanks for England's good government. When India was lying in the dust, exhausted and helpless, only just reviving a little, it was no use saying to her, "You must help yourself." If no other feeling prompted such action—though he contended there could be no higher object of ambition than to raise up a nation of 200 million souls—selfishness alone should lead Britain not to drain India entirely dry. Many speakers had mistaken his views, but all had agreed that India required further help ; and in replying to the charge which had been made against him in some quarters, of not doing justice to the good services which England had rendered to India, he had simply to submit a Dr. and Cr. account which he had sketched out, and to which he believed no exception could be taken.

Cr.—*In the Cause of Humanity.*—Abolition of suttee and infanticide.

Destruction of Dacoits, Thugs, Pindarees, and other such pests of Indian society.

Remarriage of Hindoo widows, and charitable aid in times of famine.

Glorious work all this, of which any nation may well be proud, and such as has not fallen to the lot of any people in the history of mankind.

In the Cause of Civilization.—Education, both male and female. Though yet only partial, an inestimable blessing as far as it has gone, and leading gradually to the destruction of superstition, and many moral and social evils. Resuscitation of India's own noble literature, modified and refined by the enlightenment of the West.

The only pity is, that as much has not been done as might have been in this noble work ; but still India must be, and is, deeply grateful.

Politically.—Peace and order. Freedom of speech and liberty of the press. Higher political knowledge and aspirations. Improvement of government in the native States. Security of life and property. Freedom

* Sir A. Cotton told me, after the meeting, that I was quite right, that about 1850 the poor people were very wretched.

from oppression caused by the caprice or avarice of despotic rulers, and from devastation by war. Equal justice between man and man (sometimes vitiated by partiality to Europeans). Services of highly-educated administrators, who have achieved the above-mentioned good results.

Materially.—Loans for railways and irrigation. (I have been particularly charged with ignoring this, but I consider it one of the greatest benefits you have conferred upon India, inasmuch as it has enabled us to produce more than we could before, though there is not yet enough for all India's ordinary wants, and I have said this in my paper.) I cannot ascertain the exact amount of investments in irrigation works, but I take them to be about 10,000,000*l.*, making the total 110,000,000*l.* The development of a few valuable products, such as indigo, tea, coffee, silk, &c. Increase of exports. Telegraphs.

Generally.—A slowly-growing desire of late to treat India equitably, and as a country held in trust. Good intentions.

No nation on the face of the earth has ever had t[illegible] of achieving such a glorious work as this. I hope in this [illegible] the account I have done no injustice, and if I have omitted any item which anyone may think of importance, I shall have the greatest pleasure in inserting it. I appreciate, and so do my countrymen, what England has done for India, and I know that it is only in British hands that her regeneration can be accomplished. Now for the debit side.

DR.—*In the Cause of Humanity.*—Nothing. Everything, therefore, is in your favour under this head.

In the Cause of Civilization.—As I have said already, there has been a failure to do as much as might have been done, but I put nothing to the debit. Much has been done, or I should not be standing here this evening.

Politically.—Repeated breach of pledges to give the natives a fair and reasonable share in the higher administration of their own country, which has much shaken confidence in the good faith of the British word. Political aspirations and the legitimate claim to have a reasonable voice in the legislation and the imposition and disbursement of taxes, met to a very slight degree, thus treating the natives of India not as British subjects, to whom representation is a birthright.

[I stop here a moment to say a word as to a mistake into which my friend, Mr. Hyde Clarke, fell, in supposing that I desired the government of India to be at once transferred to the natives. In my belief a greater calamity could not befall India than for England to go away and leave her to herself.]

Consequent on the above, an utter disregard of the feelings and views of the natives. The great moral evil of the drain of the wisdom of practical administration and statesmanship, leaving none to guide the rising generation. (Here, again, have I been misunderstood. I complain not of Englishmen returning to their own country, but of the whole administration being kept entirely in English hands, so that none of the natives are brought up to and taught the responsibilities and duties of office, so that we have none amongst ourselves to guide us as our elders, and to teach us our duties as citizens and as moral beings. A foster-mother or nurse will never supply the place of the real mother, unless she shows

more kindness and attention to her charge than the real mother, and the natives will therefore naturally follow their own leaders, unless you prove more kind, humane, and considerate. Draw these leaders on your side.) The indifference to India, even of a large portion of those who have had an Indian career, and who are living on Indian pensions. The culpable indifference of a large portion of the people, the public press, and Parliament of this country to the interests of India; therefore, periodical committees of inquiry are absolutely necessary, for the knowledge that such will take place would be a check on careless administration. With regard to the native States, though their system is improving, it is most unjust that their cases should be decided in secret. The frequent change of officials is a constant source of disturbance in policy, and though it may be unavoidable, it is none the less hard upon India.

Financially.—All attention is engrossed in devising new modes of taxation, without any adequate effort to increase the means of the people to pay; and the consequent vexation and oppressiveness of the taxes imposed, imperial and local. Inequitable financial relations between England and India, *i. e.* the political debt of 100,000,000*l.* clapped on India's shoulders, and all home charges also, though the British exchequer contributes nearly 3,000,000*l.* to the expenses of the colonies. The crushing and economically rude and unintelligent policy of making the present generation pay the whole cost of public works for the benefit of the future, instead of making the political like all other machinery, and distributing the weight so as to make a small power lift a large weight by the aid of time. The results of trying to produce something out of nothing, of the want of intelligent adaptation of financial machinery, and of much reckless expenditure; in financial embarrassments, and deep discontent of the people.

Materially.—The political drain, up to this time, from India to England, of above 500,000,000*l.*, at the lowest computation, in principal alone, which with interest would be some thousands of millions. The further continuation of this drain at the rate, at present, of above 12,000,000*l.*, with a tendency to increase. (I do not mean this as a complaint; you must have a return for the services rendered to India, but let us have the means of paying. If I have a manager to whom I pay 1000*l.* a year, and he only makes the business produce 400*l.*, so that 600*l.* a year must be paid him out of capital, any man of business can see what will be the result. Peace and order will soon be completely established by the closing of the concern.)

The consequent continuous impoverishment and exhaustion of the country, except so far as it has been very partially relieved and replenished by the railway and irrigation loans, and the windfall of the consequences of the American war, since 1850. Even with this relief, the material condition of India is such that the great mass of the poor people have hardly 2*d.* a day and a few rags, or a scanty subsistence.

The famines that were in their power to prevent, if they had done their duty, as a good and intelligent Government. The policy adopted during the last fifteen years of building railways, irrigation works, &c., is hopeful, has already resulted in much good to your credit, and if persevered in, gratitude and contentment will follow.

Contra.—Increase of exports; loss of manufacturing industry and skill. Here I end the debit side.

About Sir A. Cotton's remarks I would just say this. Suppose rice could be got at the shipping ports in India at 6*s.* a cwt., and transit to this country cost 2*s.* more, the price at which people here get it is only about 9*s.*, and not that people here pay 24*s.* for which in India natives pay only 6*s.* If it were so, if English people would be kind enough to give us 24*s.* or 18*s.* for what in India fetches 6*s.*, we shall be very thankful, and rich in a very short time. Again, if an article costs 5*s.* here, and takes 1*s.* transit to India, the people in India have not to pay one-third (or 2*s.* only) of what you pay for them, but have to pay with ordinary profit 7*s.* for the article. What I suppose Sir A. Cotton means is, that for certain necessities of existence here you require somewhat more material, and therefore more money, than in India. That is true; but what I maintain is, that comparatively less as the absolute wants of natives may be, these have not even been sufficiently supplied. It must also be remembered that the wants of the natives of Northern India are greater than in Southern India. But to say that the natives of India would not like to enjoy as much the good things of this world as any other people, is neither fact nor nature. See the manner in which the rich Hindoos and Mahommedans of Bombay live.

It is sometimes said that loans beget waste. I cannot see how money of loans can have waste in its character more than money from revenue. The right horse to saddle with waste is the officer who wastes, and not that the money is a loan. A wasteful officer would as much waste money from revenue as from loans. The condemnation of waste must be in the administrative system and men, and not in the source from which money comes.

With regard to exports being merely surplus produce, there cannot be a greater mistake than that which was advanced by one speaker, that a country could not export anything until all her own people were fed. A country might not consume a farthing's worth of its own produce, but might send it all away, and, getting in return what was more valuable, become wealthy and happy. Surplus has nothing to do with it. England formerly tried by forcible means to keep her own produce at home, but now she got corn from all the world. To sum up the whole, the British rule has been—morally, a great blessing; politically, peace and order on one hand, blunders on the other; materially, impoverishment (relieved as far as the railway and other loans go). The natives call the British system "Sakar ki Churi," the knife of sugar. That is to say, there is no oppression, it is all smooth and sweet, but it is the knife, notwithstanding. I mention this that you should know these feelings. Our great misfortune is that you do not know our wants. When you will know our real wishes, I have not the least doubt that you would do justice. The genius and spirit of the British people is fair play and justice. The great problems before the English statesmen are two. 1. To make the foreign rule self-supporting, either by returning to India, in some shape or other, the wealth that has been, and is being, drawn from it, or by stopping that drain in some way till India is so far improved in its material condition as to be able to produce enough for its own ordinary wants

and the extraordinary ones of a costly distant rule. If you cannot feel yourself actuated by the high and noble ambition of the amelioration of 200,000,000 of human beings, let your self-interest suggest to you to take care of the bird that gives the golden egg of 12,000,000*l.* a year to your nation, and provisions to thousands of your people of all classes. In the name of humanity, I implore our rulers to make up their minds not to prevent the restoration of the equilibrium, after the continuous exhaustion by drain and by horrible famines. I do not in the least grudge any legitimate benefit England may derive for its rule in India. On the contrary, I am thankful for its invaluable moral benefits; but it is the further duty of England to give us such a government, and all the benefit of its power and credit, as to enable us to pay, without starving or dying by famine, the tribute or price for the rule. 2. How to satisfy reasonably the growing political aspirations and just rights of a people called British subjects, to have a fair share in the administration and legislation of their own country. If the Select Committee solve these two problems, before which all other difficulties, financial or others, are as nothing, they will deserve the blessings of 200,000,000 of the human race.

The CHAIRMAN said he would not detain the meeting by any attempt to sum up the discussion, but there were one or two results which it might be useful to bear in mind. In the first place, there seemed a pretty general consent that, during the last few years, England had been trying to do her duty to India; that the way had been discovered by which India could be made such a part of the British empire as would strengthen both England and herself, and that the chief reasonable complaint was, that what was necessary to the end had not been done to the proper extent. When a large population like that of India began to be animated by one set of feelings and aspirations, they would feel, as all felt in England, that the performance of to-day was always insufficient for the hopes of to-morrow, and that you must continually endeavour to do more than your fathers have done if you would come up to the reasonable expectations of your children. For this reason there was no doubt room for a much greater demand upon England than she had hitherto been in the habit of considering she could be fairly called upon to meet. But what was the demand? Mr. Naoroji had said he believed the desire of Englishmen was to rule others as they would be ruled themselves, and he asked no more. But while such were the wishes and feelings of England, there was a material shortcoming in her performances, owing, as he believed, in great measure, to the habit of measuring what had been done by the limited area of our own country, We ought to go farther in the same path we had recently been following. For every mile of railway there ought to be ten, and for every mile of canal a hundred, and then it might be hoped that India would begin to approach more nearly to the condition of America, and we might be as go-ahead in India as our cousins in the West. Nor was this an unreasonable expectation, as far as he could see. The development of India's commerce had hardly begun, and he felt every confidence that the younger members of his audience would see the day when what was thought the great performances of to-day would be looked back upon as something extremely small. Above all, it must be remembered that when England was asked to lend money to India, it was not

in the way of charity, but in the way of business, and more than the average profit of home investments would be returned; so that the bargain was likely to be beneficial in a high degree to both parties. One great difficulty was, that we did not yet sufficiently know what was required, for we were but poorly informed of the wants of those whose voice was not heard in the council of the nation. He was glad to see, however, that the House of Commons was beginning to call upon the rulers of India to give an account of their stewardship, and the more of this there was the better. Another great want was, that the natives should have more voice in the passing of the laws by which they were governed; and he must say the experiment in this direction made by the admission of natives to the Legislative Councils had been most successful so far as it went, though that was much short of what could be desired. In conclusion, he proposed a cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji for his able and eloquent paper.

A vote of thanks was also passed to the Chairman for his kindness in presiding at the adjourned discussion, and the proceedings then terminated.

MEETING AT THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1871,

*For the Adjourned Discussion on the Address read by Sir Charles Trevelyan, on 27th July, 1870, on "The Finances of India."**

SIR CHARLES TREVELYAN, K.C.B., VICE-PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR.

CHAIRMAN.—We are met here to resume the consideration of a paper which was read by myself before a meeting of this Association in this room on the 27th of July last. I shall ever feel grateful for the patience and attention which was given to that paper, and I will endeavour to show my gratitude by not taking up time by any preliminary remarks. I will only observe that I have received a note from Sir William Mansfield, in which he says, "I have received a card from Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji from the East India Association as if I were a member; this, I am not, but I have no objection to be one if you would kindly take the necessary steps to have me elected; but the fact of unmembership will not, I fear, permit my presence to-day to support you in the chair." I told him, in reply, that I should have much pleasure in proposing him as a member, and I should hope, with the consent of the Council, as a Vice-President of the Association, for he is armed at all points, not merely as a soldier, but as a civilian. I also said that I was sure, whether member or not member, you would all be happy to see him here to-day. However, I suppose engagements at the War Office have prevented his coming.

Letters of regret for being unable to attend were also received from Mr. L. Bowring and Mr. C. Horne.

Sir CHARLES WINGFIELD.—As I moved the adjournment, I believe the privilege of opening the discussion to-day rests with me. I quite

* See p. 278, No. 4 of vol. iv.

agree in the opinion Sir Charles Trevelyan has expressed with regard to the employment of natives. In the first place it is our duty, I think, to give the people of the country a large share in its administration; secondly, I know many natives who are just as competent to have the charge of districts, in point of integrity and ability, as any European; and thirdly, the employment of natives leads to economy, because it is not necessary to pay natives for work in their own country such large salaries as you pay to Europeans to leave their own country. I also quite agree with the views Sir Charles Trevelyan has expressed on taxation. I believe direct taxation to be very uncongenial to the feelings of the natives of India. I know there are some who advocate direct taxation, pleading in favour of it the example of native rulers. Now, I do not consider the example of native rulers is one always worthy of imitation by the British Government; and I think it will be found that those native rulers who resorted most to direct taxation were regarded as oppressors, while those were the most popular who abstained most from it. I believe that what is called direct taxation, under native rulers, was never systematized at all, but was in the nature of squeezes. I am sure that Sir Charles Trevelyan himself has earned the thanks of the people of India in resisting the reimposition of the income-tax when the five years for which it was enacted by Mr. Wilson had expired. Sir Charles Trevelyan resisted its reimposition against the wish of the Secretary of State and Lord Lawrence; and if the course they recommended of re-enacting this tax had been adopted, it would have been regarded by the people of India as an artifice to disguise a breach of faith. I now come to Sir Charles Trevelyan's views on the financial question. He complains of the over-centralization and needless checks now existing, and he advocates a localization of income and expenditure. In pursuance of this principle he would make the civil administration a first charge upon the revenues of a province, and then allow the Supreme Government to draw ratably on the surplus for the expenses of Imperial administration, *i. e.* the army, debt, diplomacy, and home charges. In this I entirely agree. I think the army especially should be treated as a charge to be defrayed from the revenues of India proportionally. It is impossible to say what part of India the army guards more than another; the troops in the Punjab preserve peace in Bengal and Madras. But there is another point on which some definition is required—*viz.* what is to be considered the revenue of a province, because at present there is great anomaly. Bengal takes credit for all the opium sold in Calcutta, though a great part of it is grown in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh. Again, all the salt revenue levied in Upper India is credited to the North-Western Provinces and the Central Provinces, merely because the customs line runs through them, though 11,500,000 people in Oudh consume duty-paid salt. You must have a fair estimate of the revenues of each province. But the better plan perhaps would be for the Supreme Government to take the salt customs and opium revenues and then call on the provinces to contribute ratably for any deficiency; then the revenues of each province would consist of money really paid by the population of the province. According to Sir Charles Trevelyan's plan the balance of the revenues of a province, after defraying the Imperial

charges, is to be spent on the province. So far as to its being spent on the province I entirely agree with Sir Charles Trevelyan. This would be an incentive to economy. Nothing can be more discouraging to the ruler and people of an economically governed province than to see the fruits of their thrifty administration spent on less economical provinces. I have often had it said to me when advocating retrenchment, "Whatever we save is so much the more spent on the Punjab or Central Provinces." But I regret to say that I do not concur in the proposal of Sir Charles Trevelyan to withdraw the control of the Supreme Government over the expenditure of the surplus, and leave the Local Governments to spend it as they think best. I quite admit that the Public Works Department is somewhat overbearing, too regardless of the views of the Local Governments, and too much disposed to interfere with plans and estimates; but I think this tendency on the part of the Public Works Department might be checked, without at the same time curtailing the authority of the Supreme Government. I think the present system, which requires the sanction of the Supreme Government to all important works undertaken by the Local Governments, is a sound one, and the only check on visionary schemes and wasteful expenditure. I am inclined to think the Local Governments are not so likely to exercise a sound judgment and discretion in the selection of works as the Supreme Government, because they have not the same wide responsibilities and interests in view, and would be more apt to be swayed by enthusiastic subordinates, and led away by particular fancies, without regard to the wants of the empire at large. There would be no coherence or uniformity in their plans. One Local Government would be for railways, another for canals, another for tramways, and a fourth for metalled roads; one governor would pursue a plan of public works opposed to that of a neighbouring governor, or of his own predecessor. Sir Charles Trevelyan complained of the purchase of the Elphinstone Land Company by the Bombay Government. I do not know whether that was a good purchase or not; but, supposing it was a bad one, the evil would not have been prevented by the plan he proposed, of leaving full power of selection to the Local Governments, because this transaction was sanctioned by the Supreme Government wholly at the instance of the Bombay Government. I think Sir Charles Trevelyan would himself admit that he was hardly correct in saying that the rulers of Local Governments in India are as fit to be intrusted with self-government as the rulers of the British Colonies, because, surely it is not the rulers, but the colonists, who are intrusted with self-government. The rulers of those colonies are like constitutional [illegible] cannot spend any money of their own will. Nor can I a[illegible] Charles Trevelyan that the distinction between productive and unproductive works should be dropped as a doctrinaire fancy; on the contrary, I hold with Sir Stafford Northcote that only such works as are remunerative should be provided for by loan, that is, works which may fairly be expected to yield a return equal to the interest on the money borrowed. There seems, indeed, at present no prospect of some of the railways, for which we have borrowed money, ever yielding such a return. Unless this principle be adhered to there will be no safeguard against profuse expenditure. Money will be bor-

rowed for every work that a fervid imagination can picture as productive. All roads will be said to be remunerative, because they are the means of bringing produce to market, and thereby stimulating production. The same reasoning will apply to court-houses, gaols, and police, because the suppression of crime and administration of justice give security to peaceful industry. Every project will be portrayed in glowing terms, reminding us of the prospectuses in times of speculative excitement in the Money Market. Sir Charles Trevelyan himself says—"Public works are excellent things, but financial integrity and safety are still more important." In this sentiment I entirely concur; but I do not think financial integrity and safety would be secured by the adoption of a system which would do away with the only test that prudent men of business apply to judge of the soundness of any undertaking. I think what Mr. Massey said on this subject is very true. He said, a plausible pretext can always be found for transferring charges from revenue to capital. How long such a system could go on I do not know, but sooner or later it would end in the collapse of public credit. Sir Charles Trevelyan, quoting Mr. Gladstone as his authority, puts forward as an argument against the income-tax that it relaxes the economical check. This argument, it seems to me, applies with equal force to indiscriminate borrowing. Nor can I give my unqualified assent to the proposition that when once a work is determined on it should be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. This might lead to great additional expense, because in many parts of the country labour is scarce, and if a work were to be completed at once labour and provisions would have to be imported from a distance. I do not know whether Sir Charles Trevelyan approves of a scheme that was sketched in a paper read to this Association by Sir Bartle Frere, but I rather gather from his address that he does. According to that scheme, trustees, under Act of Parliament, are to raise a large sum of money in this country, and the Local Governments of India are to be empowered to borrow money for public works from those trustees on the security of their revenues without requiring the sanction of the Supreme Government to the particular work. This scheme is based on the supposed analogy of the practice of landowners and municipalities in this country. Now I affirm, without fear of contradiction, that no landowner in this country ever borrows money for the improvement of his estate without first obtaining the consent of his tenants to such an enhancement of their rent as will cover the interest on the money borrowed. That you cannot get in India. And as regards towns, the work is determined on and the expenditure sanctioned by the ratepayers, or their representatives. Therefore, it appears to me that the supposed analogy entirely fails; and if I have objected to the scheme of Sir C. Trevelyan, I object far more strongly to this. True, Sir Bartle Frere afterwards goes on to say that the consent of the Supreme Government must be obtained to the Local Government pledging any portion of its revenues, or the proceeds of a particular tax; but is it conceivable that either the Supreme Government or the Home Government, which is to provide interest on the money raised by the trustees, would ever allow themselves to be made responsible for expenditure on projects over the selection of which they are allowed no control at all? Either the Supreme Government or the Home Government are

to be overridden, or the plan comes to nothing. Then there is another point which has to be looked at. Those great sums which have been lent to the Government of India have been lent on the security of the entire revenues of India; and confidence in that security would be rudely shaken if the Local Governments were allowed to alienate the revenues of India piecemeal. I hold that the control of the entire revenues of India must rest with the Government of India, subject to the Secretary of State, to be entirely in the hands of the Government of India in the event of any great emergency occurring. This plan of Sir Bartle Frere's appears to be rather one of disintegration than of decentralization of finance. Sir Charles Trevelyan says, what India wants is cheap capital, and this also is the panacea of my friend Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. I say India has had cheap capital; I call 5 per cent. cheap. No doubt a great deal more could be usefully employed. The only question is, how much more can India pay interest on? A nation, like an individual, ought not to buy more than it can pay for; and seeing that for the four years ending 1869 the expenditure exceeded the revenue by 6,000,000*l.*, India has been buying rather more capital for public works than it could afford. Then as to the speed at which the railways are to be carried on, I am satisfied with the rate of progress the Government of India proposes—that is, to spend 100,000,000*l.* in thirty years. I think the principle they have laid down is a sound one; namely, to limit the amount borrowed by the sum that can be spared annually out of the revenues to meet the charge for interest, and, as the receipts from existing lines increase, and the aggregate charge for interest diminishes, to bring forward new loans, so as to keep the annual charge for interest within a certain amount. If you depart from this principle you must charge interest to capital, a vicious system which is not now allowed in the case of companies who bring bills before Parliament; or else you must do what is much the same thing—borrow money to provide the interest, a course that would very soon bring the credit of India to the level of that of Egypt or Turkey. It appears to me that it is of the highest importance that the Government of India should preserve its credit at its present high state, because you can never feel sure that some great emergency will not arise, when it will be necessary to raise money on Indian credit in this country. If we had discounted all our credit before the mutiny, we should have had to issue stock to the amount of 80,000,000*l.* instead of 40,000,000*l.* to put down the mutiny. Then, as to the magnificent promises of direct and indirect return from public works in India, so constantly held out to us, all I can say is, that experience does not bear them out. The Government of India have stated it distinctly, as the result of their deliberate opinion and experience, that a line of railway, well selected and economically made, may be expected to yield returns equal to the interest on its cost within from ten to fifteen years from the completion of its entire length, and not before. Then take the Ganges Canal, which was finished seventeen years ago. It paid 5 per cent. for the first time in 1869. If interest during those fifteen years had been charged to capital, it would not pay 5 per cent. for a long time to come. Then, as to indirect returns, take the district which I have known very intimately—Mozuffunnugger; a canal runs through that district which has been in operation

seventeen years. Quite recently I have read that the assessment in that district is under revision, and they are fixing precisely the same revenue rates which they adopted thirty years ago before the canal was commenced. The district of Goruckpore, in Upper India, a district which I know well, has yielded at re-settlement the most sensible increase to the revenue of all the districts in the North-Western Provinces. In that district, consisting of 6000 square miles, there is not a canal, nor fifty miles of metalled road. What is the cause of the increase? Simply that a great deal of waste land has been brought under cultivation. We hear of the enormous returns of the Madras canals, but it has been stated by Mr. Smollett, I think, that they are made up by crediting to the canal the land-tax of all the land brought under cultivation, and do not consist of the water-rate merely, whereas that land would probably, as we have seen elsewhere, have been brought under cultivation under any circumstances. I hear of great projects of canals in Oudh, a country in two-thirds of which water is to be found within five or six feet of the surface, where there are abundant facilities for irrigation from tanks; a country in which famine is never known. I am perfectly certain that those canals will never yield 5 per cent. The Government of India admit themselves that they have no faith in the profits of irrigation canals, for last year they brought in a Bill to levy a tax at the rate of 7 per cent. on the capital spent on canals from the owners of the land, within the reach of irrigation, though they should not use the water. I affirm, then, that works of public utility are very slow to yield any return in India, and we should regulate our expenditure accordingly. I think the opinion expressed by the Government of India on this point, and approved of by the Secretary of State, is pregnant with truth. They say, blindly to enter into schemes of railway extension, without considering the financial results, but trusting to the growth of the Indian revenues to meet the charges for interest, is a course which cannot be seriously discussed by those responsible for the finances of India. A few words on the recent decentralization order of the Government of India, on which I spoke at some length in the House of Commons. It appears to me to be good, as far as it goes, but it goes a very little way. Sir C. Trevelyan asks, and in that I agree with him, that some control should be given to the Local Governments over their surplus receipts. Now, this plan gives them none—it simply gives them control over a certain allotted amount of expenditure—that is to say, that whereas formerly they had to get sanction in their budgets to the expenditure on each particular service, they can henceforth distribute the gross sum allotted as they please. Then what can be more absurd than to take one year and stereotype the grants of that year as the limit of all your future contributions from the Imperial revenues. One province would require one year more than another, and another year less than another; but here a fast line is drawn at 1869–70. What the Local Governments ask for, and what I and Sir Charles Trevelyan think it is only reasonable that they should have, is, that the surplus left after defraying the cost of their civil administration and the Imperial charges, they should be allowed to spend in the province, that it should not be diverted to other provinces. I have been obliged to express my dissent from some of the recommendations and views expressed by Sir Charles Trevelyan in his paper. Now that

we have a Committee of the House of Commons on Indian finance, the views of those who agree with Sir Charles Trevelyan, and of those who agree with him partly, or dissent from him, will receive full consideration. I must add, and I hope nothing I have said will lead anyone to suppose that I think otherwise, that any recommendation coming from Sir Charles Trevelyan is entitled to the highest consideration and attention, because Sir Charles Trevelyan has shown, in a most marked manner, in the course of his official career, that no personal consideration will deter him from denouncing any measure which he believes to be unjust or dangerous; and therefore we have the strongest possible guarantee that any views he expresses are founded on deep conviction, and we know that they are on wide knowledge and experience.

Mr. SMOLLETT.—Everyone who knows me must know that I take a deep interest in the finances of India, I therefore need not apologize for detaining you by making a few general remarks; and I hope I shall not exceed ten minutes, though ten minutes is a very short time in which to discuss such a subject.

CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Smollett's remarks are always so valuable that we would gladly give him more law than that.

Mr. SMOLLETT.—In June last Sir Bartle Frere read a paper to this Association on what he considered was the collapse of credit in India. The impecuniosity of the Indian Government he attributed almost entirely to gross mismanagement in the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department is an enormous department of the Indian Government; I believe the salaries of its officials and its servants would break the back of nearly a million sterling per annum. Now, that department not only superintends the ordinary repairs of Government edifices and other public works, but it is intended to supervise the expenditure of four or five millions sterling annually on what are termed, but falsely termed, reproductive works. Sir Bartle Frere proposed to relieve the Governor-General of India and the Secretary of State for India of all responsibility for the outlay of this sum, and to vest the responsibility of the expenditure in a paid Board of Commissioners sitting in some back street in London. Now, I protest against this scheme; I protest against relieving the Governor-General of India of what is one of his most important duties. Former Governor-Generals (Lord Ellenborough, Lord Dalhousie, Lord William Bentinck), were their own financiers. Now we attempt to relieve the Governor-General of all responsibility as regards finances by sending out a Finance Minister from this country. Mr. Massey, Mr. Laing, and Mr. Wilson, have made a great mess of Indian finance. Former Governor-Generals used to be their own law-makers, with the assistance of the Advocate-General. Now we send a man with a salary of 10,000*l.* or 12,000*l.* a year, who makes Acts of Parliament by the mile. I would hold the Governor-General responsible for almost all the acts of the Indian Government, and relieve them of their Finance Minister and their law-maker from England. The proposed Board sitting in this country would be, in my opinion, a perfect nuisance. The paper read by Sir Charles Trevelyan to this Association is a very able, a very comprehensive, and a very perspicuous document. It puts the saddle on the right horse—it declares that the vice of our Indian Government is extravagance. Sir Charles

Trevelyan conclusively shows that every department of Indian administration is tainted with what he would call a profuse, but what I call a profligate, expenditure of the public money. Sir Charles Trevelyan, having filled a very important position in India himself, treats lightly and speaks kindly of Indian administration. He says the Royal Administration of India, since the East India Company was superseded, has been high-minded, open-handed, munificent, yet untainted with vulgar jobbery. Those are brave terms, but in my humble judgment they do not correctly describe the result of the administration during the last eight or ten years, for the facts recited by Sir Charles Trevelyan himself do not justify those terms. He spoke of two millions of money having been voted for that Bombay reclamation scheme which was referred to by the gentleman who last addressed the meeting. I think that was a great job. Sir Charles Trevelyan also spoke of half a million being absolutely wasted in making a railway to an imaginary port called Port Canning. Sir Charles Trevelyan spoke in reprobation of a sum of money comprised in the last Budget of Sir Richard Temple for buying the canal in Cuttack. I had the honour of a seat in the House of Commons when that job was being perpetrated, and I endeavoured to expose it and to prevent it. I brought forward a motion of censure in the House of Commons, in which I got very little support. I showed that that company had spent the whole of their capital and had not got a single shilling of return. I showed that that company was devoid of credit, for no one would lend them a shilling on their works now that they were made; and I protested against the concern being bought at a premium when the shares had been at 25 per cent. discount in the London market, and unsaleable at that price. But that company had got some political and some vulgar support. At the head of it was the gentleman who is now the bottle-holder of the Premier in the House of Commons, the hon. member for Perth, and he had interest enough to get the Government to purchase that undertaking, not at 25 per cent. discount, but at par, and not only were the company paid the whole of the money which they had disbursed, but 5 per cent. from the time of its disbursement, and 120,000*l.* was paid to the directors and the secretary to make everything smooth and pleasant.

A Voice.—55,000*l.*, I think.

Mr. Smollett.—Whatever it was, it was to make things smooth and pleasant. That I think was a gross political job. Sir Charles Trevelyan has spoken of a great many millions sterling being spent on barracks which were found uninhabitable after they were erected. Has any notice been taken of that by the House of Commons? On the contrary, the authors of it and the Governor-General, who sanctioned it, have been rewarded by peerages and ribbons. Sir Charles Trevelyan is well aware that a million of men died of absolute starvation in a province close to Calcutta through the sheer neglect of the officials in India. I cannot help thinking, bearing these things in mind, that to speak of the Government as having been munificent, is an abuse of language. Recklessness, incapacity, and jobbery have been, in my opinion, rife in India during the last eight or ten years. What, then, is the remedy? The remedy is, as Sir Charles Trevelyan points out, retrenchment in every department of the State—retrenchment in the Civil Department, retrenchment in the

Military Department, retrenchment in the home expenditure, and retrenchment and unsparing parsimony in that sink of corruption the Department of Public Works. We do not require to send out to India a gentleman like Mr. Massey to devise new methods of taxation to vex the people of India. In 1828 the Government of this country sent out India the very best Governor-General, I think, they ever had—Lord William Bentinck. Lord William Bentinck had not got half the revenue to deal with that the present Government of India has; the Government was at that time in great pecuniary difficulties, but by unsparing retrenchment he brought about a surplus, paying off a large amount of loans, and leaving a very flourishing exchequer to his successor. Any Governor-General now, possessed of the same firmness and ability, and animated by the same zeal, which characterized Lord William Bentinck, might, in my judgment, cut down the expenditure in India by at least four millions sterling; and I think, that should be fully insisted on. I have no faith whatever in the Committee now appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into this matter. Nothing has so much pleased me in the observations made by Sir Charles Trevelyan, in the paper which we are now discussing, as what he says on the subject of irrigation works. He says, "Irrigation works executed in a spirit of thrift and moderation are highly profitable—the smaller ones especially—dams between hills, and so forth, but I can foresee nothing but waste and bad work in the magnificent [illegible] forward by the present Finance Minister in the name of [illegible] of India." Now, what is this programme of Sir Richard Temple's? It is to borrow 30,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* to spend on what are, I repeat, falsely called works of reproduction. Those so-called works of reproduction I have been talking against for the last twenty years; and it was because I spoke so much against them that I was ostracized by the authorities in India; and this condemnation of these gigantic Government works is the more gratifying to me, coming as it does from a gentleman of Sir Charles Trevelyan's position, because certainly when he was in India I do not think he raised his warning voice very powerfully in reprobation of the expenditure upon those works. Certain it is that the Government over which he presided, the Government of Madras, is the one that is most blamable for having circulated the most pernicious views as regards the profits from those works. I am glad, however, to see that Sir Charles Trevelyan has now shaken off the trammels of the Manchester politicians on this point, and that he now denounces the carrying on of those gigantic projects, though sanctioned by Colonel Strachey and Lord Lawrence. In my judgment the Committee will be deluged with evidence to show the great productive nature of those works. I believe they will be deluged with evidence to show that we ought to borrow 100,000,000*l.*, if need be, in carrying out productive works. Now, I have no objection in the world to 100,000,000*l.* being borrowed, provided the interest be paid from the profits of the works. If those works would give 20, 30, or 100 per cent. per annum profit, I would not grudge those who lent their money to carry on these works 10 or 15 per cent.; but I protest against the revenues of India being made answerable for those loans. Let those who lend their money get their interest from the profits of those wonderful undertakings.

Mr. MAITLAND.—I am afraid that what I am going to say will fall rather tame after the eloquent denunciations of the gentleman on my right. Before I make a remark or two on some of the points embraced by your paper, I wish to say one word on one important point which the gentleman opposite glanced at, *viz.* the employment of natives of India in the Government service. I, not being a Government servant, being only a merchant, am not qualified to grapple with that subject, but having for some time occupied a position in the Legislative Council of Bengal as one of the outside members, and having in that capacity been associated with two native gentlemen, who are now dead I am sorry to say, I may say so far as my experience there went, it seemed to me that the natives of India were very capable indeed of rendering very great service to the Government. Those two men were men of great intelligence and great information; they rendered great service there, and they would have rendered great service in any deliberative assembly in the world. What I wish to refer to in the paper you read, is what you said upon the subject of export duties upon produce, and what you said upon that most important question, the opium revenue. The other night I heard Mr. Grant Duff's speech on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons, and I was glad to hear him say in reference to the question of the export duties that the Customs duties were retained rather on the ground of necessity than of principle. I have always entertained the feeling that the imposition of Customs duties on some articles is calculated to injure the commerce of India. It is generally admitted that export duties upon articles of produce that can be procured from other countries are very apt to be dangerous. Mr. M'Culloch says that such export duties are dangerous where the article exported, or a substitute for it, can be produced in other countries. I may mention that so far back as 1857 I myself had an opportunity, at a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, of urging upon the Government of India, who at that time were contemplating doubling the duties upon rice, that that was a dangerous course. I had just returned from China, where I had seen the very large extension of trade between Hong Kong and Bangkok which was then taking place. They then doubled the duty, and since then they have doubled it and doubled it again, in spite of the urgent remonstrances of the merchants of India, headed by the Chamber of Commerce, who pressed upon the Government in every way the impolicy of that measure. The result has been that since that time large quantities of grain have been shipped to China, not only from Bangkok, but also from Cochin China, and from the Mauritius. Then we know what has taken place in the case of saltpetre, showing the danger of the imposition of these high export duties. It was believed at one time that saltpetre was a monopoly of Bengal. I myself believed that it was so, and the Government who at first imposed an export duty on it of only 3 per cent. afterwards raised the export duty to such a rate that the chemists of Germany manufactured such large quantities of saltpetre from nitrate of soda brought from South America, that the trade of India has never been able to recover itself. Now, if we consider the immensely increased means of intercommunication that there now are, not only means of intercommunication by telegraph, but speedy means of getting all sorts of produce to market, and when we

bear in mind that one country checks another, it must be obvious that any plan for levying enormous export duties, or even moderate export duties, upon produce, unless you are morally certain that you can in that country upon whose produce the duties are levied produce the articles at a rate cheaper than in any other country, must be attended with a very great amount of danger. With reference to the opium duty I have myself at different times, in this room, in letters, in newspapers, and in conversation with Members of Parliament and others, endeavoured, as far as I could, having seen a great deal of that opium trade, to point out the very great danger of relying upon that very productive article of revenue. I should hardly do so again, but that I heard Mr. Grant Duff, the other night, speaking of the revenue for the year and of a telegram that he had received, use these words, that "opium had come to the rescue." He did not attempt, and very wisely, to account for the improvement in respect to opium; it might be from the fact that prices had fallen, as we know very often when prices fall there is a reaction. However, somehow or other, there has been a considerable increase in the Government revenue from it; but if the Government of India trust too much to that—if they believe that opium will come to the rescue permanently, and relax in the smallest degree their endeavours to discover some other source of revenue which will supplement, or, in case of need, when the time has arrived, provide a substitute for, the opium revenue, I am sure that they will incur very great danger indeed, because all we hear from China shows that the increase of cultivation there has been very considerable indeed; and, sooner or later, I think our Government will have to make up their minds to a very large reduction indeed of their revenue from that source. I will not attempt to enter into those subjects touched upon in your paper which are so familiar to me as questions connected with commerce. I am much more in favour of productive works than the gentleman on my right or some other gentlemen are, and I believe, if taken properly in hand, and pushed forward quickly and made economically, they will be a source of great advantage to India. It must be a matter of great gratification to us all to see, within the last year or two, three of the native princes of India coming forward and helping the Government to make, by lending money at a low rate, or by themselves making, railways; and I believe they will find the benefit of it. Upon the question of decentralization, I heard the paper of Sir Bartle Frere with a great deal of interest, and there appeared to me to be a great deal of force and truth in what he said. I think in many cases the Local Governments feel where the shoe pinches, and they may be able to reduce expenditure in a way that the Central Government, with the enormous extent of country they have under their rule, and the immense affairs they have under their control, may be unable to do.

Mr. TAYLER.—Having spoken at the last meeting, I do not know whether I am in order in speaking again.

CHAIRMAN.—No doubt the meeting will be glad to hear you again.

Mr. TAYLER.—Sir,—The subjects treated of in the interesting paper which you have read are so various, that it is perfectly hopeless, during the short time afforded us for discussion, to follow it throughout; neither

is it possible for me to enter upon all those points which have been touched upon by the speakers who have preceded me. I will therefore merely offer a few remarks upon one or two matters—questions of very deep importance to us and to India, and questions upon which unfortunately there is a very great difference of opinion. The first is that which appears to me in reality to lie at the root of all our future hopes of India, of all prospects of success in financial administration, and of all the blessings which may be expected from the Almighty on our dealings with the great empire of India, and that is the condition of the people. I read with surprise but at the same time with great gratification, if your statements can be substantiated, this account of the ryots, or peasantry, of India. You say wages had risen from two annas a day, which was the old rate, to eight annas a day; and then you say—I will here quote your words:—"But the most remarkable improvement is in the agricultural population of peasant proprietors, and their families and dependents, who form the great bulk of the inhabitants of India. They have become emancipated from the village money-lenders, to whom they have been enthralled time out of mind. They have been elevated to a state of physical ease and abundance, so that the time has now obviously come for commencing their education and moral improvement on a comprehensive, systematic plan. They are now so well off, that innumerable stories are current about the fancy bullocks in which they indulge, and the marriage portions they give to their daughters; and Oriental imagination has even marked the change by the characteristic mythical ploughing with a silver ploughshare. The agriculturists are the only class to whom the great rise of prices has been pure gain. The merchants have had immense losses from the panic and collapse of trade; the Government has lost by high salaries and prices what it gained by high prices; but the peasants have kept their share, and their share was the largest. The result is that the poor ryot, with his scanty subsistence, is a thing of the past." This, sir, is a most charming picture. It spreads a roseate hue over the indigenous brown of the country; and if it is really true, I am sure I for one shall return thanks from my heart and soul. But, sir, I see no authority given for the statement, at least if it is to extend over many parts of the country. At all events, there is on this, as on every important subject connected with India, an extraordinary diversity of opinion, and I do hope that, if the Committee of the House of Commons really does its duty, one of the subjects which will be taken up and carefully sifted will be the position of the ryot. Now, sir, it was only the other evening that we were told in this room that the great mass of the people of India were paupers, and that the ryot was a miserable creature, living on only 2*d.* a day, and content with a few rags to cover his nakedness. Not only is the silver ploughshare mythical, but the fancy bullock is, as far as my experience goes, mythical also. I have seen no bullock, at least in Bengal, bigger than a new-born English calf, or the gigantic cat of the English pantomime. The people scratch the surface of the ground with a plough not much bigger than an Irish shillelagh; they worship their cattle, and burn their manure, and the consequence is, as far as my experience goes, and from all the information I have ever received (except as regards particular places like Bombay, where there has been an unnatural rise in price, and consequent temporary prosperity),

the people are ground down to the earth, and are quite unfit for the burden of taxation. But you, sir, are a great authority; you have made this statement, and I do hope, for the sake of the poorer people of the country, that it will, on inquiry, be substantiated, for the contentment and prosperity of the millions of the people lie at the root of all our success in administration, and of all our future prospects in India. Passing from that question, I now come to another point, on which again we find considerable difference of opinion, that is the question of productive and non-productive works, with which is connected also the result of the public works altogether. We have just heard very strong opinions upon that subject, more especially with reference to irrigation, and I think it is to be regretted that the great Water-god, Sir Arthur Cotton, was not here that he might, of his own authority and from his own data, answer those remarks. I myself am impressed with the deep conviction that the future material prosperity of India is bound up in iron and in water, that is, in the extension, as far as it can possibly be accomplished, of cheap locomotion and transit by land and water, railway or canal, for man, for beast, and for produce. The question of irrigation has been discussed for some years past. When I was at Simla, seven years ago, the discussion was at its height, and then commenced that violent conflict of opinion on both sides which still rages, in which one side says the works are utterly non-productive and ruinous, and the other says they are so productive and beneficial that there can be no prospect of future advancement without them. We have this extraordinary state of things; works are continued before our eyes; the water is distributed; the fields are cultivated, and witnesses give evidence as to the advantage derived from those works; and yet up to this day we find opinions so antagonistic to one another as Sir Arthur Cotton's and Mr. Smollett's. The real value of the Committee which has been appointed (and I think the Association may take to itself some little satisfaction for having, to some extent, as far as its influence extends, forwarded the appointment of that Committee) is not that the members will themselves bring any great experience to bear on the subject of their inquiry—certainly not such an amount of experience as you, sir, or many others who have spoken and written on the subject possess—but that they will have the power to examine witnesses, and witnesses most competent to speak on all those points on which there is such a difference of opinion; and on that account it is that I cannot say with Mr. Smollett that I have no confidence in that Committee. If we have a Committee of upright, honourable English gentlemen, impressed, even to a small extent, with the importance of the subject before them, if at their disposal are placed all the means of examination and inquiry, why should we not confide in the result of that examination? I believe it will lead to the settlement of many great questions of principle now floating in an atmosphere of caprice and fancy, and that opinions on a question of practical improvement on which the welfare of the country depends will no longer be tossed about as they now are between one controversialist and another, and such a result will be of infinite benefit. Having said so much on the subject of irrigation, I will simply add a few words on the question of productive and non-productive works and the principle on which such works ought, in my opinion, to be carried out. I do not agree that there is no dis-

tinction between productive and non-productive works. I see a great distinction, though I thoroughly agree with you, sir, in saying that what are often called non-productive works are in reality productive. I think a barrack, if it is really a barrack and not a sun-trap, if it really conduces to the health of the soldier, conduces also to the reduction of expenditure, it is therefore beneficial, and to that extent a productive work; but it is very difficult to say to what extent. I cannot calculate the lives of so many soldiers as having been saved, and reduce the saving of bone and muscle to a money value as I can the returns from a railway or a canal. I consider, therefore, if any line is to be drawn (and I think, in practice, we must draw some line), it would be wise to draw a hard and fast line between those works which give a return in money and those which do not. I feel confident that all will arrive eventually at this conclusion, that non-productive works—those which do yield a return—must be paid for, if they are necessary, out of the revenue of the country, but that if the revenue cannot afford to pay for them, they ought not to be carried out at all. To spend millions upon enormous five-storied barracks is an absurdity, and the expenditure upon such works as barracks, and even gaols, is utterly inexcusable, unless there is a distinct available surplus to meet them. If there is not such a surplus, and if they are considered essentially necessary, then we must, by retrenchment in some other expenditure, meet the costs. But if we are ever to have any future development of India's resources, if there is to be such a thing as locomotion and transit provided for the enormous and unlimited produce of the country, we must have extensive works of locomotion and transit, and these must be met from loans. I think it perfectly absurd that the present generation should be burdened with taxation for works which are as productive and beneficial to our posterity as to ourselves. And I believe unless that principle is accepted we shall make very little progress in the future development of the country. I have selected those three questions for remark, in order to prevent occupying further time, because they are questions which involve principles. These questions are, first, the development of the country by productive works, and the payment of those works by loans; secondly, the payment of necessary works which are *not* productive out of revenue, and the avoidance of all expense on such works if there is not revenue sufficient; and thirdly, the ascertainment of the real condition of the poorer classes of the community. Those are three great questions, in themselves sufficient to occupy the whole attention of the Committee. I cannot close without congratulating the Society that you, sir, and others like you who have the advantage of long official experience, take the pains to come here and to record your opinions, and elicit discussion, and give your countenance to the efforts of a Society which, whatever it was some years ago, is now earnestly and conscientiously devoted to the best interests of India.

Colonel RATHBORNE.—I myself have studied for a very long time the productive resources of India, and the best mode of developing them. I have heard and read a good deal about taxation, and how to arrange it, and what power to give to one Government, and what power to give to the other; but I think the whole of this shifting about of the expenditure from Government to Government is a thing that does not touch the root of the matter. I consider with Sir Charles Trevelyan that the income-

tax is wholly unfitted to India, for one reason alone, that it is hateful to the people, and that it involves the necessity of having recourse to measures to enforce it which are to them perfectly detestable. I also think the result shows that it utterly fails of what it is expected to do, *viz.* to draw fairly and proportionably from the income of the people, for this reason: as I understand, the income-tax at the present moment is 2½ per cent., and it produces in round numbers somewhere about 1,000,000*l.* 1,000,000*l.* at 2½ per cent. would represent an income of 40,000,000*l.*; but while an income-tax on only 40,000,000*l.* is paid, we know perfectly well that the total taxation which the people of India pay is something like 50,000,000*l.*, and consequently it is utterly absurd to suppose that 40,000,000*l.* can be the proper amount on which income-tax should be paid, because the income taxable must be enormously in excess of what is taken in taxation. We have heard a great deal about productive works. My opinion for many years has been that the most productive work in India, as in any other country, is a proper land system. I believe that a proper land system is at the foundation of the prosperity of every State in this world. We know perfectly well, as a matter of fact, that when Prussia was depressed to the greatest possible extent a great statesman arose, who gave an effective land system to the country, and prosperity immediately ensued. In Ireland the great curse has been an ineffective land system, under which no man would invest money in land or produce, and the consequence was that no produce, comparatively speaking, was produced. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in the paper which he lately read before the Society of Arts, points to this remarkable fact, that while the exports of England amount to nearly 6*l.* 10*s.* a head of population, those of British North America to about 3*l.* a head, and those of Australia to about 19*l.* a head, those of India are scarcely 4*s.* a head. Now, I ask you as men of common sense, if Australia, if British North America, and if England, were under the same land system as India, do you believe that their exports would be a farthing more per head than from India? The reason why England is great, and exports largely, is because under its land system it is able to develop its resources to the utmost; and the same reason applies in proportion to British North America and to Australia. If Australia was under the same system as India, the land being let to tenants at will at two shillings an acre, or what you please, with a perpetual power of revision whenever necessary, Australia would be in the same condition as it was when it was in the hands of the savages. The foundation of the agricultural prosperity of England was the abolition of feudal tenures in Charles the Second's time. In your paper you refer to the large expenditure of 8,000,000*l.* on public works. But taking it ratably with the population it would amount to 800,000*l.* in England. If anybody came here, and talked of 800,000*l.* being about to be expended in public works, not only railways and roads, but works of irrigation, his hearers would burst out laughing. I suppose one firm of engineers would, probably, spend ten times as much in a twelvemonth. In India you do not find anything of that sort; and why? Simply on account of your land system. You say to a gentleman who holds land under the Government, "Why do not you subscribe to railways?" He would answer, "Why should I? even if it passes through my land, and the value of the

land consequently increases, the Government takes an additional tax." In England it is not necessary for the railways to be made by the Government, but they are made by manufacturers and by landowners, to whom the railways are of great benefit. We know that the value of land will rise sometimes from 40*l.* per acre to 400*l.* per acre, merely by a railway coming to it. If you introduce a proper land system in India, the land will fall by natural gravitation into the hands of those best fitted to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded them, and the produce of India will be doubled and quadrupled; you will have no want of exports or of imports, everything will be changed, as it always has been under similar circumstances, and it never will be till that is done.

Mr. BRIGGS.—We want free trade in land.

CHAIRMAN.—If no other gentleman wishes to speak, I will, with your permission, make a few remarks. This has been a most interesting and useful discussion, but it has been far too comprehensive to be summed up in a few words; and it is quite unnecessary that I should make the attempt, because all the proposals that have been made, and the arguments that have been adduced in support of them, will soon be subjected to the test of an independent and competent tribunal, the Select Committee of the House of Commons. I will therefore confine myself to remarking on two or three important circumstances which have transpired since we last met in this room. The first is the appointment of the Select Committee of the House of Commons. We all, no doubt, should agree with Mr. Tayler that the advocacy of the East India Association has had some influence in what I hope will result in being a great boon to India; and, perhaps, our discussions may at last suggest some points for the consideration of the Committee. It appears to me that the House of Commons acted quite rightly in confining the Committee to Finance, because Finance is the central point of Government. Every operation of Government, legislative or administrative, either begins or ends in Finance. Things at first sight most remote from Finance are found, on full investigation, to depend upon it. To what do we owe our liberties? Why is England a free constitutional country? Because the representatives of its popular constituencies had the power of the purse. And, if I am not mistaken, a proper regulation of Indian finance will result in benefits innumerable to the people of India. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in his excellent paper, stated that, according to his view, India under our rule suffered from two great evils—the physical drain, and, what he calls, the moral drain; by which he means that able and experienced administrators, the Elphinstones and Metcalfes of a former generation, and the Lawrences and Freres of the present generation, while they are at the height of their experience and ability leave India and return to England, to fill positions of more or less importance here. Now, if a proper system of local administration is established—if the finances of India are properly decentralized—a native school of administration will be established—a training school for future legislators and administrators—a school of self-government—the pupils of which will, in a generation or two, leave nothing to be desired; and when that end has been attained, the masters and teachers may be allowed to take their leave without any injury to the country. I will not enter upon the question of a Joint Committee. It would be hardly respectful

to the House of Commons to do so, but I regret that the co-operation of the House of Lords has not in some way been obtained. I watched with great interest the proceedings of the Committees of the House of Lords and the House of Commons in 1853; and the Committee of the House of Lords, comprising among its members Lord Lansdowne, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Monteagle, admirably performed its part; and I still hope that in some shape or other, the large amount of talent, of public spirit, and public experience in the House of Lords will be brought to bear upon the benefit of India.

Another circumstance which has given me great pleasure has been our friend, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's paper on the Commerce of India. It appears to me to be not only a statesmanlike and able, but a really original paper, reflecting great credit on the natives of India, and full of promise of their future progress—a paper quite worthy to be read and considered by Members of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords who will take part in these Indian discussions. He especially brings out in a very distinct manner that the object at present is *to re-establish Indian credit.* Everybody who knows anything of India must agree that substantially the finances of India are in a very satisfactory state. The whole substance is there. The fault is in the manipulation—in the application. First, we have to correct the loose habit of expenditure which has grown up of late years since the régime of the old Company, who, whatever faults they may have had, were remarkable for their thrift. This has appeared in the profuse expenditure in the administration of the army; the lax expenditure on public works; the subsidizing and buying up of public companies, and the sentimental, and I am afraid in its root very questionable, expenditure in wholesale grants to native princely families. I mention these by way of instances, but the fact is that there is what Mr. Smollett calls a [illegible] and what I call *a profuse, habit of expenditure.* That has [illegible] and undoubted characteristic of the Government of India during the last few years, which has to be corrected; and I look to this Select Committee of the House of Commons to furnish the correction. It will be a perfectly independent Committee, far above any suspicion of yielding to any class interest, however powerful, whether mercantile, military, or anything else. Whatever else it may be, or not be, this Committee will be superior to every vested or personal interest, and will give us an independent opinion.

We shall look to this Committee for settling several great controversies. One, the question between direct and indirect taxation, which was discussed in my previous paper, and has now been treated with much ability by Mr. Maitland. Another, the question of how far public works should be chargeable to revenue, and how far they may properly be paid out of loans. On that point it appears to me that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's paper has great merit. He strongly condemns the practice of charging to revenue expenditure works of a class which other Governments, including that of England, habitually charge to capital. With the permission of the meeting I will read a short passage from his paper:—"And, lastly, what is still worse, the withdrawal of so much capital, which at present is very dear, and insufficient for the ordinary

wants of the production and commerce of the country, Government using capital worth 9 per cent. and upwards" (I should have put it much higher than that) "when it can easily get the same in England for 4 or 5 per cent., causing thereby, to a poor country like India, a serious loss, and shutting out England from safe investments in a country which is under its own control. Paying for these ordinary works from revenue, or from terminable loans, makes the whole difference to the people between being crushed by a load or carrying it with the greatest ease." Then he goes on to explain the cause. "The hesitation for borrowing is grounded mainly, as far as I can make out, on one reason. It is said England's tenure in India is uncertain, and that if, after England lent a large sum, she should have to leave India, she may lose her loans." Then follows a great deal of sound and excellent reasoning, of which I will only read this sentence:—"If the Government went boldly and vigorously into the prosecution of all necessary public works by cheap loans, the production and commerce of the country, and the ability of the people to pay taxes, will increase; Government will be able to raise, with ease, larger revenue, and will be able to keep up the necessary strength of the army, the security by which will be further enhanced a hundredfold by the contentment and loyalty of the people." But I go farther than this. I consider that the real security for our loans consists in this, that our nation honestly desires the improvement of India, and applies itself, to the best of its ability, to accomplish that great object. The old Indian specific for improving the condition of the people of India was, as we all know, to drive the Feringees into the sea—the mutineers of 1857 may be considered as the representatives of that class. The modern remedy is education, free trade, self-government, improved morality. We may take the Parsees as the representatives of enlightened industry, and the native Christians, and our friend Keshub Chunder and his followers, for improved morality and religion. I hold strongly that if we succeed, as I believe we have to a great extent already succeeded, in launching India on a career of improvement on these principles, we are safe, both as regards our connection with India and the recovery of our debts from India. To improve that great continent, containing so many different nations, comprising a population of 200,000,000, to make roads and railways, to educate the people, to encourage them to embark freely in commerce and manufactures, to train them in habits of enlightened administration, all leading up to representative self-government, is not the work of a day. It will be the work of generations; and while this glorious process is in progress, the dependence of the party of progress among the natives must be upon us. I may have expressed myself imperfectly, but in this direction I am persuaded is to be found the real security for our advances in India; and I feel certain that, provided we make them judiciously, and see well to their proper appropriation, we may make them with the utmost confidence.

Another great change has taken place, which has come to our knowledge within the last few days—I refer to the Decentralization resolution of the Governor-General in Council, of the 14th December, 1870. I will briefly observe in explanation, that I never intended to advocate that the finances should be left to be administered by the Local Governments

without any check from the Supreme Government. The change must be a work of time. Great care will be required during the transition period. No doubt, the principle of the change is, that those who raise the money should spend the money; but they must be sufficiently intelligent and sufficiently organized, legislatively and administratively, all which again leads up to a representative system; but until the check from below shall be firmly established, the check from above must be carefully maintained.

Upon this Decentralization resolution I would remark, that it is highly valuable as an open recognition of the principle of self-government, the principle, I mean, that it is better that each community should raise and spend its own money, than that this should be done for it by a distant and imperfectly informed authority. But, although the principle of this resolution is highly valuable, the application at present proposed to be given to that principle is crude and imperfect in the extreme. There are other items of administration in which the Local Governments may be "supposed to take an interest," besides gaols, registration, police, education, and the medical service. Take, for instance, the great heads of expenditure, "Administration and Public Departments," "Law and Justice." Then there are various arrangements under which the different branches of the public revenue are collected, including the costs of the revenue establishments, and the taxes themselves. To return to the words of the resolution, the people of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay may be "supposed to be" at least as much "interested" in the land revenue, the salt revenue, the forest revenue, the stamp duties, and the excise upon spirits and intoxicating drugs, and in the expenses and modes of collecting them, as they are in those limited departments of expenditure which have been handed over to be administered by the Local Governments. Then there is not only a limitation of the services to be locally administered, but there is also a great limitation of the funds appropriated for the purpose. Less than 4,600,000*l.* is to be administered by the Local Governments out of 51,000,000*l.*, or less than 10 per cent. of the public revenue, and no provision is made for an increase of it—that is to say, less than 5,000,000*l.* annually is appropriated for those particular services, and no provision is made for any further increase of that appropriation out of the general revenue. Now see what the tendency of this arrangement must be. If the Local Governments wish to improve the administration of those services, they must raise the money themselves, so that there will be a strong stimulus to increased taxation. Nothing is said about maintaining a due proportion between the two separate funds into which the public revenue has been divided. However much the 46,000,000*l.* reserved by the Supreme Government may increase, and whatever additional demands may arise for a more liberal expenditure upon the localized services, no provision has been made for readjusting the proportions of the general revenue assigned to the respective objects. It is plain that the arrangement, in its detailed application, is based on no sound principle. It is impossible to dislocate either the revenue or the expenditure in the manner proposed.

The last, and to my mind, the most conclusive objection of all, is that no provision is made for placing the balance of the public revenue at the

disposal of the Local Governments. If you consider, you will see that it is *appropriation of the balance* which governs the whole subject. In the management of a private estate, what is the motive to improvement? Is it not that the improver may benefit by the increase? No matter what the charges are upon the estate, even supposing there are as many mortgages as there are coats in an onion, still, if there is a reasonable expectation of surplus in favour of the proprietor, there the motive to improve exists in full force. Just in this manner the great inducement to improve, and to administer rightly and wisely, on the part of these Local Governments in India, would be that they should have the balance of the revenue placed at their disposal to expend in the ways which they think most desirable. They all of them have objects greatly at heart, and if they had the disposal of the balance it would furnish them with the strongest possible motive for economizing and improving the revenue. I will not repeat the remarks I made upon this subject in my previous paper, but I would ask the gentlemen now present to turn to them at their leisure, and then they will see clearly what I mean. They will find them at pages 12 to 15. The substance of what I said was that the real administration of India, that is, *the real government of the people of India*, resides, not in the Supreme Government, but in the Local Governments, for which reason the income and expenditure of the Local Administrations are not capable of definite limitation. On the other hand, the Supreme Government is merely for certain limited functions, so that the income and expenditure of the Government of India is capable of limitation. Therefore, in my opinion, the departments which are to remain with the Supreme Government, such as the debt, the army, diplomacy, the Post Office, and the telegraphs, should be carefully defined, and an annual appropriation should be made of the sum required for those services, which should be the budget of the Supreme Government, to be administered by it, in addition, of course, to the general supervision which the Supreme Government would exercise over the Local Governments. After those functions, and the appropriation required for carrying them on, have been set aside, all the rest should be left to the Local Governments. That concludes all I have to say, and I thank you for the attention with which you have listened to me.

On the motion of Mr. TAYLER, a vote of thanks was passed to Sir Charles Trevelyan.

A vote of thanks was also passed to the Society of Arts for the use of their room.

PETITION of the COUNCIL of the EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION, presented in the House of Commons on Friday, the 17th February, 1871, by Sir CHARLES J. WINGFIELD, C.B., K.C.S.I., M.P.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament Assembled.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of the EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION, of No. 20, Great George Street, in the City of Westminster, by the Council of the said Association,

SHEWETH,

That your Petitioners' Association is composed of more than One Thousand persons, both Europeans and Natives of India, and comprises Peers of the Realm, Members of Parliament, Officers in the Army, Merchants and others, who have associated themselves together for the purpose of watching the public interests and welfare of the inhabitants of British India as regards all questions of importance connected therewith, and aiding the measures of Government in the work of administration.

That at a Meeting of the Members of your Petitioners' Association held on the 27th day of July, 1870, a Resolution was passed, that with a view to meet the present critical position of public affairs in India, to allay the alarm and dissatisfaction produced by the recent enhancement of taxation, and to place the financial administration of the country on a sound and satisfactory footing, your Petitioners' Council be requested to prepare and present an Humble Petition to Parliament for the appointment of Select Committees of both Houses of Parliament to make a searching inquiry into the general administration, both at home and in India, of Her Majesty's Indian territories, more especially in relation to the conduct of the Financial Department since the transfer of the Government from the late Honourable The East India Company to the Crown.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that a Select Committee of your Honourable House may be appointed to make an inquiry into the general administration, both at home and in India, of Her Majesty's Indian

territories, more especially in relation to the conduct of the Financial Department since the transfer of the Government from the late Honourable The East India Company to the Crown.

And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

The Petition was signed by the following Members of the Council:—

Field-Marshal Sir GEORGE POLLOCK, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., &c.
Colonel W. H. SYKES, M.P., *Vice-President.*
EDWARD B. EASTWICK, Esq., M.P. for Penryn and Falmouth.
W. S. FITZWILLIAM, Esq.
Lieut.-Colonel P. T. FRENCH.
WILLIAM TAYLER, Esq.
S. P. LOW, Esq.
ILTUDUS PRICHARD, Esq.
Major-General Sir ROBERT WALLACE, K.C.S.I.
STANDISH GROVE GRADY, Esq.
MOULVI SYED AMEER ALI.
Captain W. C. PALMER.
Professor THEODORE GOLDSTÜCKER, Ph.D.
C. P. LUTCHMEEPATHY NAIDOO GAROO.
Lord W. M. HAY, *Vice-President.*
The DEWAN KAZI SHAHABUDIN, Minister to His Highness the RAO of KUTCH.
JAMSHEDJI JIVANJI GAZDAR, Esq.
DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., *Honorary Secretary.*

PETITION of the BOMBAY BRANCH of the EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION praying for LOCAL COMMISSIONS to take EXAMINATIONS on the spot.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament Assembled.

THE PETITION of the MEMBERS of the BOMBAY BRANCH of the EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That your Petitioners have observed with satisfaction that a Committee on the Finances of India is to be appointed this session, and your Petitioners submit that the scope of that inquiry should be widened so as to embrace generally the affairs of India.

2. That the time for such an extended inquiry has now arrived, for it is now close upon twenty years since the appointment of the last Select Indian Committee of 1852, and the essential causes which necessitated the appointment of the Committee of 1852, as also of the preceding ones of 1772, 1782, 1812, and 1832 still exist, though under different forms. Your Petitioners submit that so great and so many have been the changes that have been introduced into the Indian Empire, and so vast, so various, and so valuable has been the experience that has been accumulated since the Acts of 1853 and 1858, that the present is a fit and proper opportunity to investigate the operation of those changes, and the substantive results that have been achieved from them, to estimate and sift all obtainable evidence concerning them, and with the light of past experience, to inaugurate such a policy as the altered times have rendered necessary. Your Petitioners cannot here do more than indicate briefly some of the principal subjects which require investigation, and some special problems which imperatively demand solution.

3. That it is needless to dwell here upon the great and indisputable benefits that have been derived from the direct assumption by Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, of the government of Her Indian dominions, and the nomination of a responsible Secretary of State for India, assisted by a Council. The only point connected with this subject that would seem to require consideration is, whether the composition of the Indian Council may not be improved by the introduction of a special department for Agriculture and Commerce, and the universality of its character completed by the appointment of a native member to represent native opinion and native interests.

4. That the Legislative Councils of India established by Sir C. Wood's (now Lord Halifax) Act of 1861 have also been a success, cannot be disputed; but the experience of the past ten years has, in your Petitioners' opinion, demonstrated the wisdom and necessity of providing for a more legitimate representation of native interests than is secured simply by native rank and wealth. And it is well worth inquiring, whether some sort of an initiative representative principle cannot be adopted with respect to the election of the additional members.

5. That it is a subject of great importance and moment to determine whether the time is not now come, when it will be advisable largely to popularize municipal institutions in places where, under the present system, municipal Boards, with a majority of Government officials, act without a proper feeling of responsibility, by intrusting municipal affairs to persons who have the confidence of the people, and, in large towns, are elected by the ratepayers themselves.

6. That it is established beyond doubt that the principle of competitive examinations, introduced by the Act of 1853 for entrance into the Indian Civil Service, has worked most successfully and beneficially, and it demands serious attention whether it would not be wise to adopt, for the purpose of facilitating the entrance of natives into the Service, some other measure (like that of holding examinations in India, and afterwards requiring the selected candidates to proceed to England for a short visit) instead of the one incorporated in Clause 6 of the East India (Laws and Regulations) Act, which revives the obnoxious system of patronage, and aims a fatal blow at the integrity of the competitive principle.

7. That it is a subject of equal importance to consider, whether it is not fair to the natives of this country, and conducive to the interests of the Service itself, to introduce the competitive principle in the disposal of Uncovenanted appointments, and, with this view, to hold periodical examinations in the Presidency towns. Your Petitioners observe, with regret and alarm, that almost all the higher Uncovenanted appointments in the Customs, the Police, the Revenue Survey, the Finance, the Forest and the Political Departments have been conferred, on the principle of patronage, upon persons who are not natives of the country; while mere writerships on trifling salaries, and a few higher appointments in the Revenue and Judicial Departments, are all that are left to the natives. Independently of the fact, that the substitution of the competitive system would secure, as in the case of the Covenanted Civil Service, the real efficiency of the Uncovenanted Service itself, a larger infusion of competent native agency in the place of comparatively less efficient European officers would be a very desirable measure on economical grounds.

8. That the subject of Indian Finance is causing the greatest anxiety to all discerning men. The spectacle of serious mismanagement in financial administration which has been lately exhibited, joined with the imposition of a new and peculiarly unpopular tax, without any adequate case for increase of taxation, has evoked a spirit of discontent and dissatisfaction, to allay which are required prompt and adequate measures. Your Petitioners trust that the whole subject of Finance and Financial Administration may be thoroughly and searchingly investigated, and large

and statesmanlike measures devised, commensurate with the urgency of the occasion, and calculated to strike at the root of the evil. The whole country demands with one voice a broad and effective scheme of Decentralization, which, without impairing its unity by minute dismemberment, would allow the special peculiarities of provinces as large and various as some of the great countries of Europe to be properly consulted, and their special capabilities to be taken advantage of. The recent Decentralization Despatch, wrested by force of public opinion from the Government of India, though valuable in nothing else, may be considered so as an unwilling testimony to the universal demand for the adoption of the principle of Decentralization.

9. That, besides the radical defect of over-centralization in the financial system indicated above, there is another potent cause disturbing the financial equilibrium in a most alarming manner, in the inordinate growth of the Military Expenditure, absorbing full one-third of the total revenues of India. Your Petitioners firmly believe that there can be no greater political and financial blunder than that of keeping a huge native and European army, at an enormous cost, in a country whose position, unlike that of the countries of Europe, renders it perfectly unnecessary to assume an armed attitude in the face of its neighbours, and where the only use of an armed force is to preserve internal tranquillity—an object which, at a time when the feelings of loyalty and of appreciation of the beneficent and civilizing influences of British rule are getting fast and firmly ingrained into men's thoughts and convictions, cannot require a European force larger than was sufficient to quell even the Mutiny, and a native force bigger than that whose co-operation alone gave that Mutiny a threatening aspect. Your Petitioners therefore submit that this enormous drain upon the energies and resources of the country should be wisely and courageously checked by reducing the size and cost of the Indian armies to just and reasonable dimensions, and introducing economy in military expenditure.

10. That, in connection with the subject of Finance, it is needful to investigate and analyze what are called the Home Charges, and to ascertain whether the whole of some of the items, and the greater portion of the others, ought not, in justice and equity, to be borne by the English, instead of the Indian Exchequer. Your Petitioners would point out, as an instance, the excessive charges on account of military depôts for the army in India which do garrison duty in England, the whole of which expenditure has been saddled on the Indian Treasury since the amalgamation scheme was carried into effect after the mutinies. The details of the expenses of the Indian Establishment in England, so out of proportion when compared with those of the establishments for the colonies, also require careful examination. And your Petitioners submit that England is bound, in honour and duty, to lay down some fair and equitable principle on which to share the burden of expenses required for the mutual benefit both of itself and India.

11. That it also demands attention whether the present system of excluding all natives, no matter what their rank and position may be, from the ranks of commanding officers in the Army, is not radically unjust, and alienates the affections, and wounds the pride of the military

classes in the country. The disarmament of the whole civil population of India to an extent which leaves large tracts of country exposed to the ravages of freebooters and wild beasts, unmans whole nations, and disables them for all self-defence, is a grievance which demands serious and searching investigation, as, in the present juncture of affairs, this policy of distrusting the loyalty of Her Majesty's subjects is peculiarly fraught with peril to the interests of both England and India.

12. That no question more nearly and essentially affects the whole well-being and prosperity of India than that of the development of its vast material resources; and it is of the utmost importance to decide, without any further delay, on the prosecution on economical principles and more thrifty management of such public works of undoubted utility as railways, roads, irrigation works, canals, reservoirs, &c. The subject of irrigation, which has been of late so much discussed, is one of special urgency, and your Petitioners trust that the awful lessons taught by the famines in the North-Western Provinces, Orissa and Rajpootana, within the short space of ten years, will not be disregarded or lost sight of.

13. That the question of ways and means to provide for the prosecution of Public Works has been long ripe for settlement, and it is now high time to determine whether the cost of Public Works in a country which, though rich in resources, is exceedingly poor in capital, is still to be defrayed out of current revenue, or whether it is to be met by a proper system of loans and sinking funds, as is the method of England and Europe generally. Your Petitioners also recommend for consideration whether it were not really a just and wise as well as a generous policy to offer an Imperial guarantee for Indian loans, similar to the guarantees extended to Greece and Ireland, a policy, which, without costing really the British Exchequer anything, would be of incalculable benefit to the mutual interests of both countries.

14. That a vast deal of new experience has been acquired with respect to the subject of Education which also requires careful consideration, and the time is now arrived for a liberal and thorough revision of the Educational despatch of 1854. The system of grants-in-aid, inaugurated by that Despatch, has been found inadequate for the requirements of the country, and stands in need of being supplemented by a system which, without leaving unsolicited private spontaneous assistance, would not allow existing institutions to be starved while waiting for such aid. The present expenditure on public instruction, bearing a ratio of only a per cent. to the total revenues of the country, is so trifling, that an increase of it to at least two per cent. may be considered to be necessary under present circumstances. The comparative claims of popular and high education, which have been recently so much agitated, also require to be calmly examined and fairly adjusted.

15. That various defects in the Administration of Justice cry loudly for effective remedies. It is a well-known complaint that a most grievous delay takes place in the decision of Indian Appeals in the Privy Council. Another subject, requiring grave consideration, is that of the administration of justice in the Mofussil by officers not trained for that special object. In India, the law is fast becoming technical, not in the sense of antiquated subtleties after their use and meaning have passed

away, but in the sense of a scientific accuracy and definiteness. In this state of things it is of paramount importance to weigh the merits of the present system, and to deliberate whether it ought not to be superseded by a system which would require candidates for judicial posts to qualify themselves in a special manner for the proper discharge of the duties that might devolve on them. This problem is of still more importance, when it is remembered that the exposition of the Law indirectly means legislation to a certain extent.

16. That the relations of the Native States with the British Government are at present carried on in an unsatisfactory and confused manner owing to the want of known and well-defined international principles for their practical regulation. The constitution of the Political or Diplomatic Service requires to be organized into a proper and effective system, taking care to introduce in it as largely as possible educated native agency, without which the evil influences of the Amlah can never be completely counteracted.

17. That, besides these various subjects and problems indicated above, there are others too numerous to be mentioned here.

18. That your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that the Select Committee, appointed by your Honourable House to inquire into the Finances of India, may be directed to inquire fully into all these various and important subjects, and into Indian affairs generally, and may be empowered to send out Local Commissions to take examinations on the spot, and ascertain the views of competent Europeans and Natives throughout India.

RULES.

I.—Objects of the Association.

Article 1. The East India Association is instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

II.—Members.

Article 2. The Association shall consist of Resident and Non-Resident Ordinary and Honorary Members.

Article 3. Honorary Members shall have the same rights and privileges as Ordinary Members.

Article 4. Honorary Members shall be nominated by the Council at any Ordinary Meeting, and shall consist of persons who have distinguished themselves in promoting the good of India.

Article 5. Ordinary Members shall be nominated in writing by two Members of the Association, and elected after ten days' notice of such nomination, at the next General Meeting of the Council, if approved by a majority of two-thirds present thereat.

Article 6. The Election of every Member, both Ordinary and Honorary, shall be recorded on the Minutes of the Council; and the Secretary shall forthwith notify, by letter, his election to the Member, and request such Member to furnish a standing order on his Banker for his Annual Subscription.

Article 7. Ordinary Members shall pay an Annual Subscription of £1, or 10 Rs., on the 1st January in every year; or may compound for the same by payment of 100 Rs., or £10, which shall constitute a Life Member.

Note—Total Annual Subscription, including Journal (delivered free of Postage)				£1	5 0
Life Subscription	ditto	ditto	..	14	0 0
Annual Subscription (including Journal) in India	..	..	13 Rupees	8 Annas.	
Life Subscription	ditto	ditto	150	„	

III.—Mode of Management.

Article 8. The Management of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Thirty Ordinary Members; Five to form a Quorum; and Eight to retire annually by Rotation, but eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

Article 9. A President of the Association shall be appointed at the Annual Meeting; and the Council may, from time to time, nominate distinguished Indian Statesmen, or others, as Vice-Presidents, subject to the confirmation of the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 10. The Council shall appoint a Secretary, and such other Employés as may be necessary, and fix their Salaries and Emoluments.

Article 11. The Council may fill up Vacancies in their own body, until the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 12. The Council shall meet on the First Wednesday in the month; but the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, or any three Members of the

Council may at any time convene a Meeting by giving three days' notice.

Article 13. The Council may appoint Special Sub-Committees of not less than Five Members of the Association, three of whom shall form a Quorum.

Article 14. At the desire of Five Members of the Council, or on the written requisition of Ten Members of the Association, the Secretary shall convene a Special Meeting of the Association.

Functions of the Officers.

Article 15. The President, or in his absence any Vice-President, or in the absence thereof, any Member shall preside at the Annual or Ordinary Meetings of the Association.

Article 16. The Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council, or in their absence any Member thereof nominated by those present, shall preside at the Meetings of the Council.

Annual Meeting.

Article 17. The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of May in every year.

Article 18. General Ordinary Meetings of the Association for promoting the interests thereof, and for the discussion of subjects connected with India, shall be held at such times and places as the Council may appoint.

Article 19. A statement of the Accounts of the Association shall be prepared, audited by one of the Members of the Council and one Member taken from the general body of the Members of the Society, and circulated with the Report of the Council to each Resident Member ten days before the Annual Meeting.

Local Committees.

Article 20. Local Committees shall be appointed in India by Local Subscribers, subject to the approval of the Council; and the co-operation of independent Local Associations in India is invited by the "East India Association."

Bye-Laws.

Article 21. The Council shall have power to make and alter any Bye-laws for the Management of the Association.

Alteration of Rules.

Article 22. No addition to or alteration in these Rules shall be made, except at the Annual Meeting of the Association, previous notice being given in the Circular convening the Meeting.

Journal of the Association.

Article 23. The Council may, in their discretion, publish quarterly or otherwise, a Journal, containing a Report of the several General and other Meetings of the Association. Papers submitted for discussion shall be published *in extenso*, or not, as the Council may decide.

JOURNAL

OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

MEETING AT THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1871.

MAJOR EVANS BELL IN THE CHAIR.

Paper read by WILLIAM TAYLER, Esq.

Popular Education in India.

The Chairman of the Council, E. B. EASTWICK, Esq., C.B., M.P., having been prevented by illness from attending, Major EVANS BELL was called to the chair, and opened the proceedings shortly after eight o'clock by observing that both from want of experience, and from being conscious of a certain prejudice against Government education, he felt very much disqualified to preside on this occasion. But Mr. Eastwick being absent, from a cause which they must all regret, he was told that there was no one else to take the chair. He had not given the special question of industrial schools much attention, but had never been able to feel much enthusiasm for official schools of any sort. Some of his doubts and objections he had expressed in what he had written on the subject. He had much pleasure, however, in introducing Mr. Tayler to the Meeting, who could speak of personal labours and experience to which few who were present could pretend, and, he was sure, would inform them of much that would prove novel, as well as instructive to all of them.

Mr. TAYLER.—The subject of Popular Education, whether in India or England, is a subject which, at the present moment, is concentrating the attention of the philanthropist and the statesman in both countries. My present purpose is to offer some observations on the subject as it affects the millions of India. But I cannot willingly enter upon a discussion of this question without making some reference to the events which have lately taken place in India, and the animated controversy to which those events have given birth. It is probably well-known to many of those present, that the Government of India having, after much consideration, arrived at the conclusion that the education of the people has been, to some extent, sacrificed to the education of the higher classes, has resolved to withdraw a certain portion of the funds hitherto

devoted to the latter object, and apply it to the former. This resolution, as we can well understand, has led to a very warm and somewhat bitter controversy. The party whom I may call the High Educationists—and those who maintain the theory that civilisation must always commence with the higher strata of society, and descend by a gradual process of filtration to the lower—have strongly protested against the change; while those who have taken the lower strata of the people, comprising, as they do, many millions of our fellow-creatures, into their sympathies, have rejoiced at this movement in their behalf.

Unhappily, this purely educational question has been mixed up with a collateral question of taxation, and the accidental mixture has added strength and bitterness to a controversy which might, under other circumstances, have been calmly discussed and amicably settled. Into the merits of this controversy, in its financial phase, I have no desire, on the present occasion, to enter. But, to avoid all possibility of misrepresentation, I would merely wish, in passing, to say, that no one can be more deeply impressed than I am myself with the great importance of that higher system of education which it is the bounden duty of the State to impart, which has already produced such excellent results—brought out the intellect of Young India, dissipated the errors and superstitions of centuries, and is now training up a body of men admirably adapted to take their place in the administration of the country, and possibly, if I may trust the spirit of late important movements, is preparing the way for still higher advancement in the path of national elevation.

I have thought it right to say so much on this subject, because I was apprehensive that, from my selecting the education of the lower classes as the subject of this paper, my sentiments might be misunderstood, and it might be imagined that in advocating the one, I disregarded or underrated the other.

And first, to assist us in realising the stupendous extent of the work which lies before the Government of India, when it undertakes the education of the people, I will just recall to your mind the relative extent and number of inhabitants of the several countries of Europe as compared with India. They stand thus :—

	Sq. miles.	Population.
England	58,320	21,210,020
Scotland	30,685	3,062,294
France	206,250	38,067,094
Prussia	137,066	22,769,436
Total	432,321	85,108,844
India	900,000	150,000,000

To disseminate the blessings of education over this enormous tract of country, and among this vast population, is doubtless the most gigantic, the most noble enterprise ever undertaken by a nation. And yet nothing less than this is the responsibility laid upon England in the discharge of its sacred trust. And this responsibility appears to have been fully recognised in the celebrated dispatch from the Court of Directors in 1854, in which the primary importance of popular education, imparted in the vernacular language of the country, as well as the benefits to be anticipated from special instruction in elementary arts, especially agriculture, are forcibly dwelt upon. It is in the light of this despatch, which we may fairly regard as the charter of popular education, that I propose to consider the subject before us.

And here I must also, in passing, say that I do not intend to enter in this paper on the subject of female education. Deeply interesting and important as that subject is, its incidents are so peculiar, and the principles to be observed in its achievement so unsettled and perplexing, that it can only be adequately dealt with by itself. I will only take this opportunity of expressing my cordial and hearty assent to the words which I have just read at the close of an address delivered the other day in Calcutta, by Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen: "If you wish to give India true civilisation, infuse purity and instil right ideas of duty into the native female mind." But at the same time, in justice to the Government which has been accused of withholding its support to the work, I may quote the words of Mr. George Noble Taylor's minute, recorded in 1868. He says in that document: "The importance of making provision for the instruction of the women of the country has never been lost sight of; but the immense difficulty of the subject in a country like India, where social habits and prejudices forbid the direct intervention of the State, has prevented the adoption of any systematic plan of operations. At different times and in various ways local projects have been set on foot, and real earnest efforts have been made to lead the people to appreciate the benefits of education for their girls; but the general apathy and indifference of the parents have paralysed the most energetic measures, and must continue to oppose a formidable obstacle, which the unaided instrumentality of the State can never hope to overcome." The only additional remark that I will make on this subject—which will, I hope, lead to much interesting discussion hereafter—is, that in spite of the formidable obstacles here enumerated, it is a fact that there are at this moment no less than 2,000 schools in British India, in which 50,000 females of all ages are actually receiving instruction. Having, as I hope, removed all chance of misconception on these points, I proceed to the consideration of the actual subject before me.

When I use the expression "Popular Education," I may explain that I refer to the education offered by the schools, which, whether in town or country, are supported by the Government, and are not the highest schools, in which English only is taught to the upper classes. These schools generally combine instruction in English and the vernacular. They are attended by the children of the lower classes—that is, the children of artisans, farmers, tillers of the soil, hewers of wood and drawers of water. It is the character of the education offered to these classes—the 150 millions of India—that I propose to consider.

I will not here attempt to present any accurate definition of the term education. Definitions are among the things to be avoided; and, as Confucius said of the gods, "Respect them; have as little to do with them as possible." But at the same time, adverting to the true signification of the original Latin word, we may, I imagine, fairly presume that the object of education is not the mere teaching of certain words or figures; but—taken in its broadest sense, and with reference to the position of the persons taught—the "drawing out" of the entire man, and qualifying him to discharge the duties allotted to him by Providence, intellectual, moral, or physical, with the greatest efficiency. Now the important practical question which presents itself is, Does the present system of popular education in India answer this purpose? Are we drawing out the moral, intellectual, and physical capacities of the people?

I cannot say whether there has been lately any radical change in that system; but I *can* speak with some confidence in regard to that which was in force some years ago, and I have sought in vain for any indications of improvement. I have read through the formidable Blue-book, printed last year by order of the "House of Commons," and though I perceive in the history of Educational progress, from 1866 to the present time, the evidence of great ability and most laudable earnestness on the part of the authorities, I do not, I confess, perceive any effective treatment of those radical defects, which appear to me to disfigure the system in force, and neutralise or nullify the benefits which it is doubtless the conscientious desire of the Government to confer, and which, to some extent, they have conferred upon the people of India. These defects, I would here wish to say, are—first, the entire absence of all clear, distinct, and systematic moral instruction; and, secondly, the inappropriate, unpractical, and unprofitable character of at least a portion of the instruction offered. And first, I would observe, in regard to morality. Religion, as we all know, has (whether rightly or wrongly, will, perhaps, never be satisfactorily known in this world) been on

political grounds authoritatively discarded from our schools. There are many who regret this exclusion, and I own myself among the number; but it is an accomplished fact, and we must so accept it. But if doctrinal Christianity is thus placed out of court, is there any good or sufficient reason why moral instruction, or what we may call practical Christianity, should be ignored? Irrespective of the mysteries of our faith, we possess a pure and perfect system of personal and social morality, the purity and perfection of which are alike recognised by Christian, Hindoo, Moslem, or Atheist. What is to prevent us from placing *this* before our student? And if it be objected that even the principles of this code may possibly clash with some of the precepts of the Mahomedan, Hindoo, or Buddhist faith, and thus involve an apparent violation of the pledged neutrality, the contact cannot be sharper, or the clashing more dissonant, than that caused by any one of those physical and scientific truths which we are now daily teaching. If we scruple not, by our geographical primers, to overthrow the whole system of the Hindoo Shastres by demonstrating that the earth is round, and does not depend for its support in ether on the horny back of the unwearied tortoise, why should we fear to demolish the oppressive bondage and unloving exclusiveness of caste, by teaching love to all men? The utmost that the Hindoo could say against the charity might, with equal justice, be urged against the cosmogony.

It is, indeed, a matter of serious inquiry and national self-examination, whether we have, through the action of our schools, given to our students any higher regard for truth, temperance, honour to parents, respect to superiors, humility, contentment, than they possessed before? I once asked a schoolboy, somewhat advanced in the education of a district school in India, whether, if he committed a fault and was taxed with it, he would confess or deny his guilt? "Deny it," said he, without a moment's hesitation, and in the most decided tone, as if confident of his ground; and the murmuring assent and approving countenances of the entire class unmistakably showed their cordial concurrence in the sentiment. The same general idea of school honesty was curiously exhibited about the same time. I had been persuading the celebrated Koer Singh—a noble old chieftain, who in 1857 was driven by injudicious treatment into rebellion—to establish some vernacular schools on his estate. He agreed at once, and promised to organise one close to his own residence, and superintend it himself. After warmly acknowledging his prompt acquiescence, I said, "Do you not see what benefits would accrue to the people and country from education?" He looked at me for a minute gravely, and replied, "Shall your slave speak the words of truth or flattery?" "Oh! truth by

all means," I said. The dignified old man then joined his hands, inclined his body slowly forward, and said: "Your Excellency speaks of the advantages of education. There is in the distant part of your slave's estate a race of people small and black, like monkeys—the very counterpart—there is very little difference between the two. If I were to drop this 'mala' (and here he touched a rosary made of roodrach seeds, alternated with gold) in their village, and go among them six months afterwards, they would bring it to me and say, 'Baboo Sahib, you dropped your mala when last you were here; we have found it and brought it you.' Well (continued he), there are no schools there; the people are like monkeys, but they are honest, and speak the truth. Now, if I were to drop this same necklace here at Arrah, where the people are educated, nay (with much significance), if I were to drop it at the *door* of the *school-house*, do you think your slave would ever see it again?" I was compelled to admit that nothing could be more unlikely. "Well," he resumed, "your slave will build a school-house at Jugdesgore, and will make the boys of the village attend. Your honour wishes it, and it shall be done; but you told me to speak the words of truth, and *that is my idea of your education.*" How far the shrewd old Rajpoot judged rightly of our system and its effects may be matter of doubt; at all events the students of our schools are, or at least were, left to pick up, as they can, such scraps of morality, such waifs and strays of virtue and truth, as they accidentally find scattered over the waves or cast on the shores of the ocean of literature; the doubtful morality, the bewildering ethics of Shakespeare, Pope, Goldsmith, and Milton, are successively swallowed down, and an "olla podrida" of incongruous moral ideas quite beyond the powers of the native mind to assimilate or digest, *passes into and pervades their system;* and so, I fear, with respect to the other virtues enumerated. As to temperance, I am not saying anything in groundless disparagement of the native character, for it is the natives themselves who bear witness to the fact; it is simply a matter of notoriety that English education too often marches hand in hand with a propensity to drink, and the book and the bottle strive for mastery; but as this painful offshoot of Western civilisation is not so common among the ordinary scholars of the lower class of schools as it is among the higher establishments at the Presidencies, at least in Bengal, I need not dwell upon it. That the grace of humility is injuriously affected, all those who have visited these schools, met the students in their walks, or listened to their conversation, will readily attest. It may be a natural effect of a "little learning," but is at times obtrusive, and well worthy of notice. And so it is with the duty of filial respect and reverence, as all might learn if they conversed with the old-fashioned parents of the pupils.

And lastly, contentment—contentment with the lot in which they are cast—perhaps the most important moral attribute of man, and which an Asiatic proverb happily terms the "key of happiness," there is little question that the system of education hitherto pursued has had the effect of rendering the pupils generally discontented with their lot.

Unless a student, after some years, obtains the object which perhaps alone has brought him to the school—unless within a given time he enters into the haven of Amlah-ship, or is admitted into the circle of the clerks' Elysium, he becomes a disappointed, restless being; he has not learned enough to enlarge his mind; he has learned enough to dissatisfy him with the utter darkness in which he formerly vegetated; enough to despise his parents, disregard his equals; enough to know, perhaps to feel, that knowledge is power, though he cannot attain unto it: disqualified for his allotted duties, he is not fitted for any other, and he becomes unbalanced, dissatisfied, a burden to himself, and a nuisance to his friends. Now, this is no trifling matter, and we may well look to it; if our education is one that teaches neither religion, morality, or truth; that converts men into wine-bibbers who were sober before; that makes the scholars unruly in their families, irreverent to their parents, and discontented with their lot; small is the consolation that the young student can quote passages from Milton, obtain some far-off insight into Shakespeare's mysteries, indue his legs in English pantaloons, and ventilate philosophic fancies in the debating-rooms of *dilettante* societies.

The absence of moral training, then, is to my mind the first and greatest blot in our present system; and I cannot but think that, at the present crisis, when popular education is about to be extended throughout the country, this question should form the subject of careful consideration, and some such comprehensive code of instruction drawn up, and such a selection of books be made, as will (as far as they can without religion's sanction) make a desirable impression on the minds of the rising generation; at all events that, whatever be the practical result, we should at least endeavour to instil the first principles of morality and virtue, as effectively as possible—principles which should be watched and enforced by appropriate control.

The second defect which I would now desire to point out is the mistaken character of the actual instruction given, which, unless it be greatly changed, is, to say the least of it, painfully inappropriate, and in many respects not only useless, but prejudicial to the receivers. And here I cannot, I think, present the nature of this system more forcibly than by quoting a passage from the notes of a gentleman much interested in these matters, written fresh after a visit of inspection to an ordinary middle-class school. The notes are not in such grave and formal

language as is usual in an address, but they are graphic, and to the point —instructive, perhaps amusing. I here read the critic's words:—

"We are in a Zillah school, containing 150 boys. Here is the second class, in which there are twenty students. Let us see what they are about. I ask the nearest boy his name. It is Bujoo Das. What is he reading? But stay, let us first inquire who is Bujoo Das; what his position in life, what the prospects before him, what are his allotted duties? Bujoo Das is a very promising lad—quiet, intelligent, and docile; his big, bright, inquiring eyes denote considerable intellectual aptitude; while his thin legs and large stomach equally indicate physical deficiency. He is the son of a small farmer earning some 40*l.* per annum from the proceeds of his farm, and, as he has a large and hungry family to support, he screws with some difficulty the means for his son's schooling. In the natural course of things the boy Bujoo would succeed to the paternal farm, carrying on his rustic operations in precisely the same way as his father, grandfather, and remote ancestors for fifty generations, varying, perhaps, his peaceful and insipid pursuits with the occasional spice of litigation with his own tenants or neighbouring landholders; but, in all probability, passing quietly down into the valley of shadows, '*more majorum*,' unlettered certainly, but without much guile; ignorant of all history, ancient or modern, but temperate withal, and quite satisfied with tepid water out of his ancestral lota for his daily beverage. Of poetry innocent, but contented with his lot. Tenderly careful of his old father, if alive, affectionate to his children, and generally kind to his wife; though he would, perhaps, beat her if the vegetable curry was not well cooked, or if his hookah is not ready when he returns from the field. Such is Bujoo in his present condition—such would he be in his future uninterrupted incidents. Well, we have got him as he is into our Zillah school, and are educating him. He is about to read—his brown finger has got fast under a line—his eyes are dilated, and he seems preparing to swallow book and all at a gulp. Let us hear what he is learning under our auspices:—

'Go, rose, my Chloe's bosom grace;
How happy should I prove,
Might I supply that envied place
With never-fading love!
There, Phœnix-like, beneath her eye,
Involved in fragrance, burn and die;
Know, hapless flower, that thou shalt find
More fragrant roses there;
I see thy withering head reclined,
With envy and despair.'

"Here Bujoo, who has read right through the stanza without a stop, pulls up with a long breath and a look of panting exultation; and

here, perhaps, I may pause and exclaim, not in exultation but in sadness of heart, 'Unhappy Bujoo—ill-fated boy! Is it for this you have left your father's rustic roof, and toiled some three years and more in mastering the most difficult of foreign languages, to be bewildered, if not corrupted, by amorous metaphors and jingling love ditties!' What possible right has Bujoo, the mild brown boy, to wish himself a rose in Chloe's bosom? What is Chloe to him, or he to Chloe? Bujoo, himself about eleven, married an infant of two years old some years ago, because Bhugwan Das, his father, and Goluk Chunder, the infant's father, so arranged it; she is now ten, and has just had her nose bored; they will soon live together as man and wife. She will make his curry and prepare his hookah. He will shut her up as if she were a favourite cow, and occasionally beat her; but as for 'never-fading love,' poor Bujoo never dreamed of such a thing. Even for an English rustic these amorous poems would be of very questionable utility; but to a native they are worse than useless—they can convey no meaning or ideas whatever except what are corrupting; for love, innocent and pure, with all its sentiments and tender fancies, is a thing foreign to his nature and habits.

"Under a Hindoo view of the passage burning and dying 'involved in fragrance' (of a peculiar kind) may be connected with each other, and therefore may convey some definite meaning, though certainly not the poet's, to this poor bewildered stripling; but 'involved in fragrance'! what 'fragrance' will he ever be involved in during his lifetime save that of garlic or cardamums? What resemblance has he to a 'phœnix;' and is he not far more likely to find his amusement when he is not 'beneath the eye of his Chloe than when Mrs. Bujoo has him under her ken? Seriously speaking, is not the incongruity, the absurdity, of filling little native boys with this rhapsodical nonsense, worse than ridiculous? Is it not positively mischievous and worthy of reprobation?

"I appeal to any sensible man whether there be anything like fitness in thus dealing with a rustic lad, whose lot is cast in the field or the workshop; whether, so far from qualifying Bujoo to discharge his task and fulfil his duty as an honest, simple, and contented agrarian, whether we are not doing our best to ruin him. Bujoo, with his Chloe, is but a specimen. Here is a little fat child, the son of a common carpenter; just look what he is puzzling his brains over:—

> 'A pin who long had served a beauty,
> Proficient in the toilet's duty,
> Had formed her sleeve, confined her hair,
> Or given her knot a smarter air!'

While the little dump next to him is completely shut up and gazes vacantly on

'His object chosen, wealth or fame,
Or other sublunary game!'

Here is a fisherman's son up to his middle in the river Granicus, and a fledgeling weaver threading through the entangled 'facetiæ' of 'Betwixt Eyes and Nose;' while a plethoric infant, the 'deliciæ' of a village potter, is in the agonies of

'Laura's cheek—where blushes rise.'

It is difficult to find words to express fitly the condemnation which such education deserves: it is not that it is frivolous and useless; but it is grossly unfair upon the pupils themselves. I need not continue the analysis; these specimens are sufficient."

Thus far my critical friend, in whose remarks I must confess I most cordially agree. While, however, this mistaken scheme of education has been in progress, and borne its unsatisfying fruit, it is gratifying to find that some thinking men have seen the evil and suggested the remedy. George Campbell, now happily made Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, in his admirable work, "India as It May Be," has forcibly pointed out some of the very abuses described, and has strongly advocated the substitution of useful knowledge and practical science. The committee appointed in 1856 referred to the same subject; and several writers in reviews and newspapers have at different times exposed the barren and unprofitable results of the present system. There is, therefore, every reason to hope some more sound, healthy, and sensible system will, ere long, be adopted; and the mischief which has for years been spreading like a canker, be changed for what is useful and good.

Mr. (now Sir George) Yule, a Bengal civilian, pre-eminently distinguished for his knowledge of the people, and his sound and practical views on all subjects of administration, some years ago recorded his opinion of the system in the following emphatic words: "I look upon the education afforded by the Mofussil Government schools with contempt, and I know no one who does not do the same;" while, about the same time, the Government of India—itself somewhat bewildered with the difficulties before it—endeavoured in vain to obtain from the local Bengal Government—equally, if not more bewildered—what they more than once officially and urgently demanded, viz., a comprehensive report on the system to be adopted for the education of the people, in accordance with the principles set forth in the Court's dispatch of 1854.

And now, as closely connected with the questions here discussed, I perhaps may be pardoned if I say a few words in regard to my own efforts to carry out into action the principles which I now advocate. It was under a deep consideration of the defects in the Government

system—a system which ignominiously failed in the province of Behar—that, when I was Commissioner of Patna in 1857, I ventured to propose the adoption of a comprehensive scheme of practical education, adapted to the wants and in harmony with what I believed to be the feelings of the *great mass of the people.*

The scheme is briefly set forth in a little pamphlet which I published at the time, and which will be reprinted as an appendix to this paper. The plan was based on the principle that unless we secure the sympathies of the people themselves they will not enter our schools in any numbers; that to secure their sympathies we must appeal to their interests, and must offer them an education which will aid and advance them in the pursuits and occupations of daily life. This principle appears to me to be almost beyond dispute. Self-interest has been ordained by the All-wise Creator as the great motive of human exertion and human enterprise; and if we are unwise enough to disregard this truth in any great national scheme we must suffer for our presumption.

After intimating my design to the Government, and obtaining for it the cordial approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, I lost no time in putting my plans into execution.

Having previously conversed with the principal rajahs, landholders, and other intelligent and influential natives on the subject generally, I felt confident of their liberal support and hearty co-operation, and I was not disappointed. In the space of a few months I received the promise of contributions to the extent of two lacs of rupees (20,000*l.*); liberal monthly subscriptions were tendered, several handsome endowments of land were made; and special gifts of cattle, books, furniture, and other useful articles were presented. The plan embraced numerous departments; there was to have been a vernacular school, in which, during a portion of the day, the elements of useful knowledge were to be imparted to the boys of the lower and middling classes; while the field, the garden, the workshops awaited them after a few hours' study, and gave them opportunity of practical instruction in the several trades and pursuits to which they wished to devote themselves. A central building, containing a museum in which all the products and fabricated articles of the province were to be collected, arranged, and classified; a library for English and vernacular works, a school of art, and other departments were in the course of construction. The land, on which the building stood, comprised an area of between 400 and 500 beegahs (the Indian acre), part of which was to have been formed into a kitchen-garden and orchard, and the rest left for experimental field cultivation. A canal for irrigation was to intersect the grounds, affording scope for testing different modes of artificial water-

raising. A gymnasium, to which all the pupils might resort, and in which the physical powers might be developed, was attached to the play-ground of the vernacular school. The improvement of cattle was also to have been systematically attempted by the importation of superior stock; while the more simple articles of machinery—thrashing and reaping machines, circular saws, and other such aids to industry—were to be gradually introduced, and their results exhibited to the natives. It was also my intention to have annual meetings of all classes—landholders, planters, peasantry, and public officers, with exhibition of produce, stock, and workmanship, and distribution of prizes, and thus unite in matters of common interest the various sections of the community. And, lastly, an orphan asylum for the maintenance and instruction of the indigent and fatherless children of all classes was to have been constructed on the ground and supported by the contributions of the community. The essential object contemplated by this scheme was to make education, in the first place, attractive, and in the second, *practically* useful to the pupils. From the hour that God's curse fell upon the earth, and thorns and thistles took the place of flowers, labour is the heritage of man, the sweat of his brow his appointed lot. Through labour, successfully applied, come civilisation, wealth, and power. The difference between a civilised and uncivilised nation at the present day, other things being equal, is in the ratio of scientific attainment. The country that has the best system of agriculture, the stoutest ships, the most effective machinery, armies of the highest discipline, muniments of war most perfectly constructed—will, under ordinary circumstances, be the strongest, most civilised, and, unless moral deformity interferes, the happiest. What I venture to maintain is, that it is by imparting useful scientific knowledge, that knowledge that gives to man a command over the elements, opens up to him the treasures of earth, shows him the mineral in the mountain, and enlists the thunderbolt of heaven in his service; that it is by such instruction that we shall enable the natives of India to fulfil their allotted task in the present life; and this, as far as the educational portion of my project was concerned, was my moving principle. And here I should wish, for the purpose of showing how this scheme was received and estimated at the time, to read five or six short letters, out of a very large collection in my possession, from several eminent men among the different classes of the community, expressing their sentiments. The first is from the well-known Dr. Duff, whose name alone is sufficient to ensure respect to his sentiments :—

My dear Mr. Tayler,—Your protest I read this morning, and can cordially

respond to every sentiment in it respecting the best modes of dealing with the natives, &c.

And now I have to thank you for the sketch, &c.

From what I had learnt from others, and your own vivid account of yesterday, my impression accords with that of others, who regarded it as singularly adapted to the peculiar exigencies of the people.

With a noble object in view; with noble philanthropic motives in the pursuit of it; and with a conscious rectitude of aim and purpose throughout, you may well lift up your head in the assurance that *sooner* or *later* you will vindicate the right.

Yea, under a new *régime* of things in India, I would fain hope that you may yet be in a position to work so noble a scheme to a glorious consummation.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) ALEXANDER DUFF.

The next letter I shall read is from Dr. Mouat,* a gentleman of eminent ability, and himself at one time Director of Public Instruction:—

Moteharry, February 3, 1857.

My dear Tayler,—I have gone through the papers which you kindly sent me, with the interest of one who has for many years advocated similar views, but was not so fortunately placed as you are for carrying them into effect.

The outline of your plan is complete and admits of no addition, the details will necessarily work themselves out as the institution gradually expands. I hope you will print all these papers as a small pamphlet for general distribution, and if I can aid you in Calcutta or elsewhere, my poor services are entirely at your command. I have no hesitation in declaring my belief that if fully and fairly carried out and developed to the extent of what it is susceptible, the blessings capable of being conferred in your province by your *plan* will not be surpassed by those of any great measure yet conceived and executed for the benefit of those entrusted by Providence to the rules of Great Britain.

With the most hearty wishes for your entire success,

I am, &c.

Then, again, here is a letter from the gallant and lamented Major Holmes, who was murdered shortly afterwards in the Mutiny, a gentleman who lived in the district, and had himself for some years conducted interesting experiments in farming and agriculture:—

My dear Tayler,—I find it hard to express the real pleasure I have felt in the perusal of the papers connected with the industrial institution.

The whole thing comes on me like the accomplishment of a long-cherished dream.

It has been said that few things give more pleasure than the accurate expression of our own thoughts and feelings, and I have frequently felt the truth of this in going over these papers.

The plans and schemes I have long dwelt on for the amelioration of this, the country of my adoption, are no longer Utopian, and my liveliest aspirations find in this a local habitation.

* This gentleman was for several years Director-General of Public Instruction, and one of the most able officers of the department.

I have already expressed to you my ideas on the first necessity of a sound, practical, rather than a theoretical, education; on the necessity of educating the body and the hand before we attempt to give a high finish and polish to the mind.

If this, your great work, is allowed free course and carried out with steady patience, perseverance, and industry, not deterred by little failures and the cavilling of the crowd (for without these no great scheme has ever been brought to perfection), I am strongly persuaded that such a success will follow as has never yet been attained by any similar enterprise—I will not say in India—but *in the whole world.*

As a practical proof of my strong approbation of your scheme, may I request your acceptance of a merino ram and four merino ewes imported from the Cape for the Agricultural and Pastoral Department; and to your orphan asylum I would gladly transfer two parentless children of six and eight years, with fifty rupees per annum, to be paid by me, until their education enable them to provide for themselves.

Should I happily be able to assist your scheme at any time with my individual exertions, I need hardly say they will be most heartily at your service.

The fourth letter I shall read is from a most able and distinguished official in Mozufferpore, one of the Patna districts—Mr. Davies:—

My dear Tayler,—I view the establishment of the industrial institution at Patna with great interest. I know of no measure for the general improvement of the country, and for ameliorating the condition of the people, which can match with it for comprehensiveness and practical utility. Individual efforts, of which many have been made at different times, seldom succeed, for want of system, combination, and unity of purpose; and when successful, the benefit is confined to small localities, for want of means of recording and making known the results to the public. Your scheme, embracing a wide range of action, is so systematically planned, that all experiments will be carried out conjointly, and also for a sufficient length of time to admit of accurate conclusions being adduced from results; and the provision you have made for publishing for general information all the operations carried on in the institution, will create inquiry and competition, and thus secure the object you have in view. It was very thoughtful of you, therefore, before commencing the extensive operations you contemplated, to lay a sure basis for their success, by providing sufficient funds; and it speaks much for the intelligence and liberality of the wealthy native gentry of the division that they have supported you so willingly and well.—Yours, very sincerely,

W. R. Davies.

The only others, though I have many more, with which I shall trouble you, are from two native gentlemen, which are interesting as showing the native opinion on the scheme. One is from the celebrated Hindu pleader, Baboo Ramapeishad Roy, who was selected to fill a seat on the Bench of the Calcutta High Court; the other is from a Mahomedan deputy collector, who received the star of India for his gallant behaviour in the well-known siege of Arrah.

Extract of a Letter from Baboo Ramapeishad Roy, Vakeel of the Sudda Court, Calcutta.

My dear Sir,—I wrote to you a hasty note immediately on my arrival, which I hope has reached you.

I have been anxiously expecting to receive from you a copy of the paper you are drawing out, containing your views in detail in regard to the different departments of the proposed industrial school at Patna. I saw Halliday since my return, and told him what you are about, and what a glorious thing the school will be. I saw Grote, and explained to him the outline of the plan. Unfortunately I cannot get much assistance from him, as he is shortly going away from Calcutta, and is to be permanently stationed at Kishennugger. I spoke to Bead about it, and he was quite struck with the greatness and utility of the measure.

From Native Deputy Collector of Shahabad to W. Tayler, Esq.

Arrah, April 5, 1857.

My dear Sir,—Many thanks for the perusal of the papers connected with the school of industry.

If I were to enumerate the blessings it would confer on the province of Behar, my letter would exceed the limits I have assigned to it.

Allow me to assure you that, if your well-concerted scheme succeeds, which it must under your able guidance, it would work a change in the destiny of India, and bring it to a level with the most civilised countries on the face of the globe. Persevere, my dear Sir, with the same philanthropic spirit which has prompted you to undertake this vast scheme of improvement, and success will attend you in every step which you take to carry it out.

I was highly disgusted to see some scandalous letters published in the *Englishman*. Let not the base malice of the enemies to the amelioration of India divert you from your noble pursuit, and let the enemy have the mortification to see that the seed you have sown has become a tree, the wholesome fruits of which are destined for India to reap.—Yours sincerely,

(Signed) *Syed Azimoodeen Khan.

I will here only add that the opinions thus enthusiastically expressed by these representatives of the several classes, were echoed as enthusiatically by all in the province, with such trifling exceptions that they are not deserving of notice. The scheme, under such encouraging auspices, commenced: the ground was laid out, sheds erected, cattle purchased, the schools opened; but shortly afterwards, under opposition, the circumstances of which I will not here describe, it fell to the ground.

But I have great confidence in the majesty of truth, and am well aware that interested or unreasonable opposition can never avail to ruin, though it may retard, what is essentially good and useful; and I have always looked forward confidently to the future revival and complete re-establishment of this or some similar scheme as the only one which will secure the sympathy of the people, or tend to the welfare and civilisation of the masses; and that this confidence has not been misplaced is, I think, sufficiently shown by the fact that some ten years afterwards, Sir Donald Macleod, the honoured Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjaub, projected a system of industrial education, in many points identical with that proposed by me, though it did not comprise

* This officer has lately been decorated with the "Star of India."

all that I had hoped to include, and it is with some satisfaction that I am able now to produce—not for any purposes of self-glorification, but merely to show how the principle which I then advocated, and still continue to uphold, after years of neglect, was again revived in the most progressive Government, and under one of the most able and excellent rulers, that India has ever known—the following official letter, written to me by him in 1866 :—

Lahore, February 2, 1867.

Sir,—I have received and laid before the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor your letter (without date) and its enclosure, having reference to a scheme proposed by you for an industrial institution ; and, in reply, I am instructed to convey to you his Honour's hearty thanks for this communication.

2. That portion of the enclosure of your letter which refers to the establishment of a school of arts and industry, together with a model farm, will prove of essential value in connexion with the establishment of an institution of this kind at Lahore, which has for a considerable time past been in contemplation ; while in the general views on education expressed by you, it is hardly necessary to say that in the main his Honour cordially concurs.

3. Amidst the conflicting opinions which prevail on this subject, the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor greatly values your support of these views, and highly appreciates the earnestness in the cause of India's healthy progress which has prompted you thus to address this Government.

I have the honour, &c.,

T. H. THORNTON, Secretary to Government Punjaub.

How far these intentions were subsequently carried out I am not aware ; but I believe their practical development was prevented by want of funds.

The conclusion, then, at which I would wish the educational authorities to arrive is this : First, that they should understand and recognise their high and sacred trust as the instructors of a nation, and therefore to some extent responsible for the future welfare of its people. Secondly, that though they accept the necessity of abstaining from the authoritative teaching of doctrinal Christianity, they should compile in practical form, adopt, promulgate, and sanction with their high authority that sublime system of morality which has been graciously given to us, and let their pupils see that moral excellence is held to be of at least as much importance as poetry or mathematics. Thirdly, that they adapt their actual instruction to the character, condition, pursuit, and prospects of the people, Do not teach the son of a carpenter to spout amatory verses to imaginary Chloes, or the cowherd stripling to bewilder his brains with the battle of Arbela, thus disqualifying both for the contented and efficient discharge of their necessary duties ; but give those whose lot is labour in the field, the mine, or the workshop, *through the medium of their own language,*

a simple and sound education in practical and useful knowledge; disabuse them of the idea that bodily work is disgraceful, that clerkdom and Amlah-ship are the only honourable objects of ambition, and show them by precept, example, and practical experiment, that God's curse of labour is in all its branches, when rightly dealt with, a "blessing in disguise;" that the steady application of their reason, their talents, and acquirements, to the purpose of their own calling and pursuits, will lead to far more honourable and permanent prosperity than the uncertain glories of the Court and the Cutcherry.

By so doing, you will gradually "draw out" and give development to the faculties of the people, lead the masses to the right use of mind and body, and enable them more efficiently than before to discharge their obvious and immediate duties.

In this way, instead of rearing up thousands of youths, with a smattering of English in their heads and scraps of poetry on their tongues, to strut and fret upon the stage of life, without purpose or object, you will gradually elevate the entire mass, increase their happiness, enlarge their prosperity, establish many and strong ties of sympathy between the governors and governed, and secure the eventual development of the magnificent and teeming country now entrusted to our charge.

Mr. KRISHNARAO GOPAL DESHMUKH, B.A.—I have heard with very great pleasure the elaborate and lengthy, as well as very interesting paper which Mr. Tayler has just read to us. I agree entirely with him that the educational department in India should pay the greatest attention to the introducing of religious instruction, which I hold to be an indispensable concomitant of secular teaching, if the latter is to result in and assume the high title of education. I do not for a moment depreciate the value of secular knowledge; but what I should like to see is, that it should be founded upon a religious basis—a basis formed of all those grand, broad truths which we find common to all religions, and which are necessary for the satisfaction of the cravings of the soul and the higher aspirations ofthe heart. For this purpose, however, it is not necessary that India need look beyond herself, or borrow from Christianity or any other religion. There is no want of moral and religious precepts both among the classical and the vernacular sacred writings of India—writings which the inhabitants of that country regard with peculiar affection and reverence. If religion means the meditation of God and His attributes, and the recognition of the Deity by man in all his acts—and if morality signifies the teaching of those duties which man owes to God, to himself, and to his fellow-creatures—I maintain that there is as much of true religion and pure morality to be found in the sacred writings in India as anywhere else in the world. Certainly they need

to be winnowed—the chaff removed from the grain; but this does not warrant our ignoring the existence of the grain. The Brahmo Somaj of Calcutta, founded by the greatest of modern Indian Reformers, the learned Rajah Ram Mohun Roy, and its offshoots, the Vedo Somaj of Madras, and the Prarthana Somaj of Bombay—are eminently the product of an enlightened perusal of the sacred writings of India by a master-mind like that of the Rajah, who found no difficulty, with their help alone, in establishing a reformed religion—a religion which stands in the foremost ranks of all religions—a religion peculiarly fitted for the spiritual life and well-being of civilised man. Mr. Tayler has just observed that the sacred witings of the Hindus state that the earth is supported by a serpent, the serpent by an elephant, the elephant by a tortoise, &c.; and he no doubt created some mirth and caused some laughter by the relation of this fanciful account. I believe that it is taken from the Purans, which are notoriously works of fiction, and it affects the validity of the sacred literature of India in the same way as the topography and physical entity of the places described in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," or Milton's "Paradise Lost," Southey's "Thalaba," or Dante's "Divine Comedy," affect the validity of the Gospel. If Mr. Tayler peruses the Vedánta, the Uphanisherdhas, the Yogaróshishta, the Bhagvadgita, and other similar works, his present opinion will be greatly altered. Truth is *one and the same;* and therefore *true religion* is all over the world *one and the same.* It is certainly a matter of regret that the wretched and ignorant priests of India, who made religion a trade and a craft, have corrupted it by the uprearing of the pernicious system of caste and of gross idolatry, and supplanting true religion by a hideous mass of superstition. They have imposed arbitrary restrictions on eating and drinking, and mixing with people of other castes and other nations. Such restrictions may appertain to superstition—and what evil practice may not?—but they can't be saddled upon religion. The slightest search into the manners and customs of ancient India will show that such restrictions were then unknown. The Brahmin often partook of the hospitality of the Kohyatriya and other castes. I would not trouble you by quotations from the sacred writings of the Hindus to prove that they contain the highest moral precepts and religious truths, for these can be found by any candid person who peruses the books I have already named; but I would simply ask if the precept, "Atmavat sarva bhutáni pashyet" (*i.e.*, Regard all beings as thyself), is not tantaimount to "Do unto others as you would be done by," which is regarded as the essence of Christian morality? Again—

> "Ananya chetáh satatam yo mám Smarati nityashah
> Tasyáham sulabhah Pártha nitya yuklasya yoginâh"—

i.e. (the Almighty says), "He who with a heart and mind solely devoted to Me, always remembers Me, to such a saintly one, O Pártha! I am easy of access." Is this not equivalent to one of the nine Beatitudes —viz.: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God"? Parallel passages like these can be multiplied to any extent; but I must desist, as I find others impatient to address the meeting. I would, however, in concluding, just remark that I see no reason why a manual containing broad religious and moral precepts, selected from Indian sacred literature, should not be compiled and used in the schools. Though there are many sects and castes in India, there is a great deal of common religious ground, and the use of such a manual would be acceptable to all. So also the introduction of Prayer, addressed to God without involving any doctrinal allusions—*e.g.*, "The Lord's Prayer"—would be repulsive to none. The English educational series used in the Bombay Presidency, and the system of instruction pursued there, and, I believe, in the other presidencies also, are altogether secular in character. No doubt the books and the system have many good points to be adduced in their favour; but I question very much whether mere secular knowledge will suffice to *educate* the human mind either here or in India. In India, where the children may be said generally to be born in superstitious and idolatrous homes and bred up by mothers notoriously ignorant, the introduction of a broad religious system of instruction, as well as of regular hours of prayer, should form a necessary part of a scheme of popular education. I consider that a knowledge of the grand principles and truths of morality and religion is the very marrow and germ of all education *proper;* and that in India the schools become peculiarly the places for emancipating children from the thraldom of superstition and prejudice, and for impressing upon their minds from an early age broad religious truths and moral principles. They should be taught early to "fear God and honour the king." They should not only know and understand the phenomena of Nature, but learn to recognise and obey Nature's God, and be trained to act, whatever part may fall to their lot in life, firmly believing in the "Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man."

Mr. R. H. Elliot.—I would offer a few observations on a part of Mr. Tayler's scheme. It is a well-known fact that you must catch your hare before you cook him. Now Mr. Tayler seems to have proposed no measure by which the hare may be caught. He has told us that education must take a practical turn, and the agricultural classes an agricultural turn. But how to catch your agriculturists? You may establish schools in the centre of every county, but without compulsion education will not be diffused as it should be. To be of the slightest

use it must be compulsory. In my opinion you should go into every village and say, now at certain seasons of the year you are not required in the field, and during these periods of the year two boys must come regularly to school. As regards the moral training part of the business, I must say I agree with the gentleman that spoke last but one. I think there is a sufficient amount of moral training to be found in the old Hindoo books. In some respects, indeed, the Asiatic religions go further than we do. The Buddhists, for instance, have never persecuted in word or deed, or condemned people of other faiths. And to show that they are even more particular in their moral commandments than we are, I may mention that the fifth commandment of the Buddhists is, "Thou shalt not become intoxicated;" and at Easter, when witnessing the conduct of many of our working classes, I thought it would be an improvement if we added this to the number of our commandments. There is another point I think it is necessary to allude to. In the country schools you should have an agricultural education, and the head-master of a country school should be an agriculturist. The immense influence a man thoroughly acquainted with farming in this country can obtain there is something astonishing. I have plantations in Mysore, and on one occasion I had to send out a Scotch farmer. I was liked very well by the natives, at least we got on very well together, but in a few months I found he had beaten me altogether; and when this gentleman died the natives actually threw away their caste to carry him to his grave. If you get a man with a thorough knowledge of agriculture, and you have a firm basis, then bind him and the schoolmaster up together. In the centre of every county I would have a head school and make two persons from each village attend, and give them every encouragement to continue their studies at the more advanced schools of the towns and capitals. The agricultural classes would thus have a chance of competing for Government situations, and this would have an excellent effect in fostering a desire for education amongst the people. One remark about getting *one* language for India. It would be impracticable, when you consider that India is as large as all Europe less Russia, and I would not press English, or spend much money in its instruction. When will a Mysoree read an English book? It is altogether out of the range of possibility, and therefore I think we should divide India into a series of nationalities. I would have a college in the very centre of every nationality, and encourage at that college the study of the language of that particular country. In this way you would soon start a series of vernacular literatures, through which information could readily be conveyed to all classes of the various communities.

Dr. WILSON.—Mr. Chairman: Though I am only a visitor at this

meeting, I beg, with your permission, to say a word on the present occasion. In regard to primary education in India, especially in its economical aspects, I very much agree with Mr. Tayler. I have been a missionary in that country for upwards of forty years, and have marked with much interest the progress of education there. I am happy to say that of late years the Government has very considerably improved its system of elementary instruction. This is particularly the case in the Bombay Presidency, to which I belong. Allowances have to be made, in connexion with the peculiar state of India, for the difficulties felt by Government in the matter of moral teaching, for that moral teaching must have a basis in recognised Divine law, directing the conscience and moral feelings of man. Passages taken from Pantheistic writings, like those quoted by my learned friend, Mr. Deskmukh, can scarcely be admitted into school books without implications and explanations with which it is difficult for Government in any form to identify itself. Such a simple preceptive teaching of morality, illustrated by anecdotes and incidents, as Mr. Tayler has in his eye, is an easier matter, and has, to a great extent, been attended to by Major Candy and Mr. Hope, C.S., in the Maráthí and Gujarátí schoolbooks which they have prepared. I agree with Mr. Tayler in his desire that the attention of Government should be directed, in the first instance, to the vernacular languages. It is a wise maxim—

> Let all the foreign tongues alone,
> Till you read and speak your own.

The prospect of a universal language is certainly very remote; and ages must intervene before such a result can be realised. Most of the languages of India rest upon an excellent basis—namely, on the Sanskrit, and those of the Northern family particularly; and hence English books can be prepared in them, and be translated into them with a great degree of accuracy. The Government, however, is not contented with primary schools. High schools have been formed, and great attention is paid in them to the English language. The university system is acting to admiration, and administered with perfect impartiality. As to female education, I most earnestly desire its vigorous prosecution. I am in no way prepared to concur with a friend who has preceded me in his comparison of the women of England and of India in the matter of morality. I have had a good deal to do with the natives, and I find they always praise the English ladies with whom they are acquainted, and admire their purity, truthfulness, and disinterested devotedness to their husbands. I have heard the expression of opinion to this effect from the prince on the throne to the beggar on the hill of ashes. I should be disposed to ask, with reference to the matter hinted at, in what

does the restraint and confinement of Oriental females originate, but in distrust of their behaviour and that of those whom they might meet? But I refrain from saying more on a matter which should not have been mentioned in the circumstances that it has been mentioned in this place. What the interesting females of India require is that instruction which they are so ready to receive and profit by.

Mr. D. NASMITH, LL.B., Member of the Board of Examiners of the College of Preceptors.—Education is a subject to which I have turned my attention very closely for some years; one in which I feel deeply interested; one which I conceive to be as important, if not more so, than any other to which the attention can be directed. I have listened with the greatest interest to the exceedingly able paper read by Mr. Tayler, and have taken down all the heads. I make this remark because some false impressions appear to exist concerning it. In my opinion the paper is as applicable to England as it is to India. We know perhaps less about education as a science than any subject to which the intelligent mind of England has been directed. Much has been said by preceding speakers concerning religion. I unhesitatingly say, that so long as we insist on intruding religion into the question of national education we shall never succeed. Of this no doubt can be entertained, that when England was yet in a state of barbarity, India was already far advanced in civilisation. Therefore India must possess (if it is true that men and nations rise in proportion to the nobility of their sentiments and principles), in the teachings of its early instructors, divine sentiments. Whether such sentiments have been marred by the priest in England or India is of little importance to the subject before us, and I trust that we shall studiously avoid discussing theological peculiarities. The illustrations given by the learned lecturer concerning the subjects taught speak volumes, and the expression "disqualifying education"—a term quite new to me—is exceedingly good. Nothing could be more forcible. I have no hesitation in giving it as my firm conviction that the major part of the instruction in English schools is of a disqualifying character. If in our schools English, for example, was taught, and progress made in our own language, there can be little doubt that we should witness beneficial results; as it is the time of the majority of the English pupils is wasted in learning things utterly useless, while the most important subjects are wholly ignored. I lay great stress upon the state of education in England, because if we undertake the education of India we shall unquestionably do there much the same as we do here. If *our* system is imperfect, how can it be expected that we shall there institute one that is perfect? I will not trespass further than by saying that I hope Mr. Tayler's lecture will be printed and

extensively read by Englishmen, to whom it may prove as profitable as to Indians.

Mr. J. LAURIE (formerly H. M. Inspector of Schools and Director of Public Instruction in Ceylon) observed that the numerous questions of detail which formed the pet theme of this or that educationist were, in all essential particulars, fully understood and more or less appreciated by efficient heads of education departments. Without depreciating the general advantages of agitation, the grand security for the introduction of enlightened and comprehensive schemes was, to arrange aright the gear of the governmental machinery. When, for example, a director of public instruction was appointed, the presumption should be that he understands his subject better than any one else. Instead, therefore, of occupying a subordinate position, and of being hampered by niggling and embarrassing restrictions, he should be assigned a place on the Council, in the capacity of Minister of Public Instruction. At all events, when his pecuniary limits have been laid down by the Government, he should be armed with full powers to administer the funds placed at his disposal, in accordance with a clearly-defined plan emanating from himself and approved by the Government. Having lately had some little experience as Director in Ceylon, he was in a position to state that the office was not regulated on any such rational principle. He had not been endowed with the power of granting a single requisition—even to the extent of a bottle of ink—until the sanction of the Colonial Secretary had been procured. And since a similar principle pervaded every department, requisitions were, of course, submitted in regular order, so that six or eight weeks, sometimes months, elapsed before anything could be done. During the south-east monsoon he received an urgent appeal from a schoolmaster for a trifling grant towards fortifying the school premises against the raging storm. The requisition was returned by the Colonial Secretary six weeks after date *negatived*, as usual; but this was of no consequence, as the premises had already been blown down. Mr. Laurie further stated that the education grant is seldom fairly expended, for the poor (for whom the public measure was originally devised) have not, to anything like a proportionate extent, benefited thereby. "You will find," he continued, "vast districts in which no schools exist, and in another *privileged* district plenty of schools kept up in an imperfect way, the cost sometimes reaching 22*l.* per head; all expended on the instruction of the sons and daughters of persons quite able to pay their own charges." During his tour in Ceylon, whenever he arrived at a village he was waited upon by a deputation asking for a school—a deputation representing the very class who contribute the largest proportion of the public tax. The natives were perfectly willing to build the requisite premises, and to his

request whether they would do this and provide a salary for the schoolmaster, he never received a negative reply. Nevertheless, on his representing these facts, in conjunction with not less than forty memorials from other quarters, the Government simply turned a deaf ear; while he was advised to regard all such demands as so many exhibitions of oriental flattery! Mr. Laurie remarked, in conclusion: "Such, is a tolerably generic sample of the way in which things are managed in the East, where even my modest proposal to *examine* the school teachers under Government was pronounced to be a revolutionary proposal. Some idea might hence be formed of the rate of progression of the most vital question of the day, in connection with a bureaucratic system of *regime* which assigns to its heads of departments the position and functions of mechanical clerks."

Mr. HODGSON PRATT.—Having had some small share in carrying out the despatch of 1854, which formed a new era of education in India, I would say a few words. Mr. Tayler's paper, Sir, may be divided into two parts—the first dealing with one defect in Indian schools, the second with another. First: The unsatisfactory character of the moral or ethical teaching. I must say that I do not think Mr. Tayler has, from this point of view, done justice to the system or its results. A tree must be judged by its fruits; and I would ask any one who is acquainted with India whether he does not think that, on the whole, the moral results of our Indian system of education have been most satisfactory. So far from agreeing with him in the view he appears to take, that the tendency of Indian school teaching is to lower the previously existing standard of morality, I think the result has been of an entirely opposite character. Let any man compare the present moral condition, moral ideas, moral tone of thought, character, and conduct of the educated natives of India with what was the case when the English first appeared among them, and I cannot but think that there must be a unanimous reply that the results are most encouraging. (Hear, hear.) If you can prove that those natives who have been brought up in our high English schools have derived the greatest possible benefit from our English literature, then, on the same principle, the natives who are attending the secondary-class schools, and have been made acquainted with that English literature, will derive corresponding benefit, though not to the same extent. No educational efforts in any part of the world have been attended with more satisfactory results than they have in India. When we came to India we found general corruption. Now the educated native is trustworthy in every sense of the word. Mr. Tayler complained of the character of the English books selected for use in the schools. From my experience of higher and secondary schools, my impression is that very different ideas

were conveyed to the Indian youths than those connected with the poetical attractions of "Chloe." The literature provided for our pupils was not confined to books or writings of that character. It comprised the great teachings of Shakespeare, Pope, Milton, and Wordsworth, described by Mr. Tayler as "doubtful moralists." The question of the best means of realising moral results by school education is of extreme importance, because it involves a principle not only applicable to India, but to England. Mr. Tayler thought that one great defect in the Indian schools was that morality was not taught by systematic treatises. I think, on the contrary, that the principles of morality are conveyed far more effectively by means of biography and imaginative literature—by morality taught in the concrete, not in the abstract. Such teaching gives far more life and meaning, and leaves a deeper impression. (Hear.) A large class of men in India must be trained so that they may be pioneers of true civilisation among their own countrymen. We must reach the people through the natives of India. In every department of Government we must rely on native agency, and the native agents must therefore be educated in English literature. As regards the second part of Mr. Tayler's paper—that which insists upon the necessity of giving a more practical character to the instruction afforded in the second grade of schools—I agree with him most thoroughly. I have taken some interest in technical instruction in England, and I know from personal experience how deficient is the provision for teaching the elements of science in our primary schools. Consequently, the workmen and apprentices who attend night schools find it very difficult to derive benefit from the instruction there afforded. We should not therefore complain because schools in India have not made more rapid progress than schools at home. Englishmen must do justice to the Government of India in the matter of education, for their efforts have produced results even more satisfactory than those in England, if due consideration be given to the shortness of the period during which education in India has had an opportunity of developing itself.

S. N. BANNERJEA, Esq. (Bengal Civil Service).—It would be impossible to select a subject of greater importance than that on which Mr. Tayler has read a paper. Before I make any remarks I will, with your permission, clear up a misimpression which exists in some quarters with respect to the exact position occupied by the natives of Bengal with reference to this great question. About eight months ago, when Government proposed to withdraw State aid from high English education for the purpose of applying it to the education of the masses, a great number of meetings were held in Bengal, and notably one in Calcutta. It has been assumed from the opinions expressed in those meetings that the educated natives of Bengal are against mass

education. It is a great mistake to think so. We all recognise the great importance of mass education We all know it would be impossible to civilise India without it. The only question is, who is to pay for it? Mr. Tayler has only hinted at it.

CHAIRMAN.—That is a question you had better not enter into.

Mr. B. (continuing).—Government wants to withdraw aid from high education and devote it to mass education. There could be no objection to this proposal if the data on which Government apparently proceeds were true, and if the burden fell where it was intended by the Government that it should fall. Government seems to think that these institutions would be self-supporting; and so they would be if they were attended by the sons of the rich zemindars only. But, Sir, I know that it is not the sons of the rich who avail themselves of the benefits of high English education, but people in comparatively humble circumstances. If Government withdraws its aid, the immediate effect of such a measure would be to compel a great many persons of this class to give up their studies, and the country would be the loser. Their talents and abilities, which, improved by high culture, would have been such a gain to the State, even in a mere economical point of view, would be almost uselessly thrown away. Besides, it is to be remembered that it is men who have risen from humble positions in life who have done the most good to their fellows. English history presents to us a number of such instances; and the same thing occurs in the East. Accustomed to labour and exertion, and with minds pre-eminently practical, they are the men who appreciate rightly what is best for those amongst whom their lot is cast, and how it is to be carried out most successfully. If, then, it is unwise on the part of Government to withdraw the aid it gives to high English education for the purpose of mass education, the question to be settled is, how can the education of the masses be accomplished? The people cannot be further taxed for it. I think it would be no injustice if a special tax were laid on the zemindars for this purpose. It is an economical fact that the zemindars have obtained a great accession to their wealth through the influence of natural causes and by the mere progress of society. To this portion of their wealth the State has an undoubted claim, provided, of course, the State allows them the alternative of paying the present market value of their estates, for that includes the present value of all future expectations. I think the provisions of the Permanent Settlement present no obstacles to such a procedure. But, Sir, I will not enter into the merits of this question. I can only allude to it. The next question to be decided is, what is to be the kind of education for the masses—English or vernacular? I, for one, would stand up for English education. What we want to give to

the masses is strong common sense ; and for such a purpose I know of no kind of instruction which possesses greater recommendations than English. I should propose that they should be taught vernacular enough to accustom them to studious habits, and then they should be instructed in the practical branches of English education. It would be a mere waste of money to teach them only the vernacular. We have had enough of the stories of the wars between gods and goblins in the Ramayana and other works. At the present moment we ought to give them an education which will make them better workmen, better agriculturists, better farmers, better citizens, and, in short, better men.

Mr. S. B. THAKUR remarked that Mr. Tayler had alluded to popular education as deficient in morality, an evil he wishes to remedy. Mr. Thakur, however, was of opinion that the Hindoos are not wanting in morality. The insinuation of Koer Singh, that schoolboys would, if the chance occurred, purloin his Mala, he considered utterly false. Koer Singh was himself no scholar, and education must needs interfere with native superstition. He would never suspect a schoolboy of dishonesty. He acknowledged that it sounded ridiculous to hear poor Bujoo Das reading poetry, but a nation cannot be civilised without sacrifices ; and he was confident that the lives, incomprehensible as they might at present be, would create profitable results, for the poor lad, learning sufficient to open his eyes to his own dark state of mind, would naturally determine that his children at least should receive the benefits of a thorough education. It was useless, he remarked, to instruct people in certain branches of knowledge without previous education, and therefore he disagreed with that part of Mr. Tayler's scheme.

Sir DONALD MACLEOD, after stating that the remarks he had heard that evening from one or two native gentlemen had rather surprised and deeply pained him, expressed his hearty concurrence in Mr. Tayler's views, and believed that the paper which Mr. Tayler had written would be productive of much good. In alluding to practical education, and the use of the vernacular languages, Mr. Tayler had expressed his sentiments exactly. He had been surprised to hear a native gentleman express the opinion that the English language alone should be employed by us as the channel of education in India. However valuable in its proper place, he utterly denied the possibility of educating the mass of the people save through their own vernacular. In connexion with this he had long advocated greater attention to the classical languages and learned lore of India than we have hitherto paid them. In former days and under native rule a man of learning, who devoted himself to teaching and literary and scientific pursuits, could obtain for himself a livelihood which was to him a sufficiency, while he was held in

great respect by his countrymen. Such, however, is no longer the case under our rule, and it is most difficult now for a man of learning to obtain a competence, if he confine himself to the pursuit of literature or science—a change which he much regretted. On this account he had endeavoured to have endowments formed in the Punjab for establishing fellowships, by the enjoyment of which learned men, who mastered their own classical languages and acquired at the same time, through the English language, a knowledge of the literature or science of the West, might be enabled to devote their lives wholly to learned pursuits, and to improving the vernacular literature of their country by translations and compositions on subjects calculated to enlighten the mind. One of his last acts, on leaving the Punjab, was to recommend that a munificent gift of upwards of 5,000*l.*, presented by the Maharajah of Cashmere, might be devoted to this object. But he could not say whether this recommendation had been carried out. He thought likewise, that in regard to education, as to all else, we should take the people of India more into our confidence than we had hitherto done; and he had accordingly established at Lahore an educational council or senate, in connection with the University College at that place, which is very largely composed of the aristocracy and gentry of the Punjab. These now take a keen interest in educational matters, which they will strive to infuse into their countrymen generally, and it can hardly be doubted that their advice and suggestions will prove most useful. "There "is one remark," he observed, "which I would lose no opportunity of "urging—viz., that to raise a people in the scale of nations, something "more than mere intellectual education is necessary; and that this can "only be attained by what may be termed political education—that is, "allowing them a share in the management of their own municipal affairs. "This I believe to be the one stimulus which, above all others, will give "a nation the desire for improvement. The mere love of knowledge in "the abstract, for its own sake, is not, if we may judge from the ex- "perience of the past, sufficient to secure a general pursuit of it, unless "its acquisition lead to some tangible reward; and no reward will prove "so acceptable or so operative, as regards the nation at large, as the "assurance that each individual will be allowed a position of influence "in the local councils in proportion as he shows himself qualified to exer- "cise it. As a nation becomes conscious of this result, in that ratio it "will become an intelligent, vigorous, and high-minded nation, and a "desire for knowledge will rapidly spring up. I have been greatly struck "by remarks made on Russia in the public press to the effect that since "the serfs have been emancipated there has been progressingly evinced "an intense desire for the attainment of knowledge as they have been

"entrusted with some share in public affairs, and their wish has been to "make themselves fit for the execution of the duties. With us, in "India, the great idea of the students in our schools and colleges is to "obtain stipendiary employment under Government. But this is not "sufficient for a nation. It must have a much larger share in all the "administrative details of social life before it can become imbued with "self-respect and a spirit of progress, and this every nation should pos- "sess. It has been remarked to-night, that even in England the system "of education is very defective, and there is, no doubt, truth in this. "Yet England has attained to a foremost place in the scale of nations, "and I for one feel convinced that this largely is owing to the republican "spirit of its institutions, which gives to a large portion of the com- "munity a voice in the administration of the affairs of the body politic, "and thus induces, on the part of all who are well disposed, a desire to "show themselves worthy of consideration. The more we can do in "India towards securing a similar result, the more I believe we shall "promote the cause of education." He went on to remark that a great deal has been done of late years, in some parts of India, by the creation of municipal committees, the establishment of honorary magistrates, and other similar measures, to familiarise the people with self-government; and although their functions are, for the most part, of an honorary character at present, such posts are highly appreciated. He expressed the hope that much more would be done in the future in the same direction; and entertained no doubt that a great stimulus to progress would be thereby afforded to the people.

Sir ARTHUR COTTON.—I am not an educationist. I have taken great interest in India, and have seen a good deal of it, as well as of the natives. I agree in the leading points of Mr. Tayler's paper, which I consider wise and practical. The two points we have to consider are these: Moral instruction and secular trainings, which will fit them for the business of life. A few years ago I was travelling with a gentleman through a country I was in charge of forty years before. "I knew every stone in this part of the country," I said. "Indeed!" replied my friend; "then what has been the effect of our rule and education?" I was startled at the question, and still more so at my reply. "Nothing," I replied. There is not a sign of change in these villages; the same abject poverty and utter ignorance as they indicated thirty-five years ago. Mr. Tayler's paper, therefore, I heartily support, and feel its wisdom and sound sense.

WILLIAM TAYLER, Esq.—I should have liked to answer the different speakers, but time will not permit. I would, however, say one or two words, because there seems to have been some misunderstanding. I in

no way intended to insinuate that no other code of religion possesses any system of morality. What I meant was that the system which has been given to us is such that if Mahomedans, Buddhists, and Hindoos were to examine it they would all recognise its sublimity and completeness as a system, irrespective of doctrinal Christianity, which of course they would not wish to include in our educational course. The opinions of Mr. Hodgson Pratt would have been entitled to greater weight had they been relevant to the subject before us, instead of being directed to the higher education, a question which I purposely avoided. I confess I cannot see, because high education has improved the recipients, that the second-class education which I have ventured to pourtray is necessarily good, or free from the defects which I have endeavoured to point out. The lateness of the hour forbids further remark, but I cannot forbear from expressing my satisfaction that my remarks have been followed by such an interesting discussion, and my extreme gratification at finding my views supported and approved by such eminent and distinguished individuals as those who have expressed their concurrence in them.

The CHAIRMAN.—Two points, I think, have come out very clearly, during the interesting discussion that has followed Mr. Tayler's address. First, there was a very general concurrence in the general object of Mr. Tayler's paper, as to the advisability of practical and industrial education being spread in India; and another was an equally general agreement that whatever deficiencies existed in the Government education of India are deficiencies which have hitherto existed under Government education in England, and which are, to some extent, being supplied and remedied. In fact, one of the most distinguished and respected educationists in India, Dr. Wilson, explained that many improvements have taken place since the time of Mr. Tayler's own experience. I think at this late hour I can only venture to say a few words in defence of a character who was introduced by Mr. Tayler under the name of Bujoo Das. It was remarked in the paper that a Hindu youth—expressly, so I understood Mr. Tayler, because he was a Hindu—could not appreciate the higher flights of lyric poetry and transcendental love. But I really think that there is no specially Asiatic deficiency here, and that the village "Hodge" in England would be as incapable of comprehending the beauties of a sonnet addressed to Chloe's eyebrow as any Hindu ploughboy could be. Another point is evident; instruction in systematic morality, such as Mr. Tayler has recommended, and which, for my part, I think certainly ought to be one of the first objects of education, is quite as systematically neglected in English education as it is in the Government schools of India. When I was at school I was

taught catechisms and collects in abundance, but as to morality, that I was left to pick up as best I could; and the same, I think, is the general experience of English schoolboys. I cordially agree with what Sir Donald MacLeod told us, with all the weight of his great authority, that the most practical stimulus of education in India must be political —the hope of a career, and of some share in the government of one's own country. By saying this I think he gave the right tone, and a fitting termination to the whole discussion of this evening. I would close by proposing what I am sure will be unanimously approved—the thanks of this meeting to the Lecturer. (Carried.)

A vote of thanks to the Chairman, and to the Council of the Society of Arts for the use of their Rooms, concluded the proceedings.

APPENDIX.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE BEHAR INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTION.

I need scarcely remark (as it is a fact now perhaps universally admitted) that there are two distinct objects to be aimed at, and two distinct modes of operation to be observed in the great work of education in India; and, though these two may be more or less linked together as time advances and leads knowledge in its train, at present they are separate, and must be separately treated.

These two objects are: First, the provision of a special standard of instruction which may qualify men for the distinctions of scholastic attainment, the pure enjoyments of knowledge, or the more material advantages of public service. Secondly, *the education of the people.*

For the first, which is a special work directly affecting the few, but in no way touching the mass (save to rivet their chains and render their darkness darker by contrast), provision, though as yet imperfect, has been made, and is daily being extended in the establishment of English schools and colleges.

All that is required to bring the thirsting few to these fountains is to make the schools systematic channels of preferment in the public service and college or university distinction.

But the great work of *national education*, which has millions for its subject, must be achieved through the language already familiar to those millions.

To a certain extent, motives of self-interest may in this work also be brought into play, as indeed they have been in this province, by making education, as far as possible, a necessary passport even to the lowest grade of service.

But even this still leaves the *nation* untouched, and it is the general uplifting of the entire mass which philanthropy desires and justice demands at our hands.

It is to be feared that if instruction is confined to *mere book learning*, the effort thus to secure the advancement of the people, if not altogether vain, will, in Behar at least, be a work of centuries.

It is idle to expect that the poorer classes will allow their sons to leave their daily occupations, and thus incur a certain immediate loss, for a prospective benefit which they neither understand nor believe.

Doubtless, a certain number of schools may be established by zemindars, and maintained through their influence and the influence of the local authorities;

still, unless we carry with us the sympathies of the people themselves, *there can be no sure or permanent vitality in these schools,* and the end will be that, immediately the external influence is withdrawn, the schools will fail.

Thinking deeply and anxiously of these things, it has appeared to me that if a system could be brought into play which would combine book instruction with practical education in industrial pursuits, the deadly obstacles presented by the apathy and indifference of the mass might be removed, and, with this idea, after much deliberation, I have ventured to propose the plan which is now about to be carried into effect.

Before entering upon the details of this scheme, I would observe generally, that the great object aimed at is to place before the people a system of instruction which, while it brings out to a certain extent their moral and intellectual faculties, will also and at the same time afford a direct and tangible object on which those faculties may be exercised, and thus to let them learn and feel that the knowledge they acquire is not an immaterial or speculative acquisition to bear fruit or not, as the case may be, at some *indefinite* future time, but the source of immediate and direct benefit to them in their necessary and daily pursuits; in short, that *they are not required to sacrifice the stomach to the brain.* Thus when the son of the carpenter, farmer, or blacksmith asks to receive instruction in his trade, I would give it him on condition that he also learn to read, write, and cipher, and make himself master of at least the rudimentary principles of his peculiar trade.

There is nothing much more saddening than the sight of a few intelligent, but unwilling pupils, conning over a humdrum and barren task, with neither hope nor interest, with no recognition of the advantage to be gained, and no faith in those who bewilder them with an unintelligible philanthropy.

Nothing could be more hopeful and interesting than a concourse of the same lads, each impelled by attachment to familiar studies, and stimulated by the prospect of real and recognised advantages, acquiring daily skill in practice and daily knowledge of principles, the foundation of future advancement.

I am hopeful that such a system, carefully organised and liberally carried out, will be successful, that it will remove the great obstacle that has hitherto been the stumbling-block in our way, and supply the great motive which moves the world.

The scheme, moreover, as now projected, has this further advantage, that in thus instructing the masses in the various industrial arts, and bringing the whole intellectual man into play, another end will be accomplished—viz., the development of the resources of the country, and a general improvement in the important science of culture and production.

Two great works will thus go hand in hand and mutually support and aid each other.

It is also so arranged that every class will have an interest in the work, from the wealthy rajah to the destitute orphan; while its catholic and comprehensive character is such as at once to refute the objections of the bigoted religionist, to put the opposing fanatic out of court, and shame the cavils of all idle objectors.

Furthermore, it will go far to re-establish the natural union between study and work, to give labour the honourable position which it ought ever to occupy; and by the contact of mind with mind, the constant sight and study of scientific results, the occasional gatherings of all classes of people and frequent succession of new objects of interest and inquiry, it may, in course of time, rouse the apathetic spirit of the people, and raise their minds to higher and to better things.

Having made these general observations I will now briefly touch upon each department of the scheme.

AGRICULTURE.

Without entering at length upon the much mooted question, to what extent the rural economy of Europe is adapted to an Indian ground and Indian climate, it is, I imagine, safe to assume that the present system is susceptible at least of *some* improvement. It is safe to assume that the skill, the science, and the researches of the West, which have of late years been brought so effectively to bear upon the great question of productive industry, must be, to some extent at least, applicable to India, and that there is no peremptory law or inherent speciality in that portion of the broad bosom of our mother Earth which basks under an Indian sun, to render it an exception to the rest of the world.

I cannot believe in what some people have called the "immutability of Indian habits."

I cannot think that nakedness, dirt, and ignorance are to be the eternal destiny of millions.

I cannot think it *necessary* that the Indian plough should only "scratch the surface of the ground," that the bullocks, whose unhappy tails are twisted by a naked ploughman, should *always* be bare-boned and ill-begotten, or that the ploughman himself should be always naked or "half clothed with a cotton cloth;" that crops should for ever depend on the accidents of weather, and no one dream that husbandry is a science, or that knowledge or study have any connexion with the earth or its products.

The object, then, of this department of the institution will be to disseminate scientific truths, to introduce new products, to test by experiment such of the more obvious of the plans and improvements as have been found eminently successful in Europe, and as may appear in the eyes of cautious and experienced people to be applicable to Indian farming; to direct the attention of zemindars, farmers, and agriculturists to these products, plans, and improvements, and to induce them to adopt such as may be found to answer or to offer fair promise and likelihood of success.

If nothing else were to be gained, it would be no little matter to have excited the interest of the landholders and people, and to have roused a spirit of inquiry.

The native mind is well able to appreciate the results of scientific experiments when made palpable to the senses, and the farmers of Behar will not be slow to adopt what is proved to be profitable.

I have no idea of attempting to force upon the people an artificial system of high farming, with its elaborate appliances and doubtful results; but I feel very sanguine that the gradual and judicious introduction of better ploughs, threshing machines, and similar aids to industry will be eminently useful.

CATTLE.

The improvement of the breed of cattle is a matter of practical utility and speedy results.

A few English bulls have, at various times, been introduced into these districts by individual gentlemen, and the greediness with which their society has been sought for, and the acuteness with which clandestine interviews have been contrived by the cow-keepers, has proved how fully they understand the value of superior stock.

The half-breeds which have sprung from this illicit intercourse are now eagerly sought for, and purchased at high prices.

This will form a regular branch of the institution, and I anticipate the hearty co-operation of the great landlords, indigo planters, and others in the work.

Whether any satisfactory results are likely to be attained by endeavours to improve the breed of sheep I cannot venture to predict, but the subject will form matter for careful inquiry and experiment.

Questions have been circulated through the collectors of the districts to all those who are supposed competent to supply information on this subject, and much valuable information has already been collected.

VERNACULAR SCHOOL.

The primary object contemplated in this school is the instruction of the sons of the middling and lower classes in useful knowledge—knowledge that will aid them in the pursuits of life, give them rational subjects of thought and inquiry, and qualify them to protect their rights and fulfil their destinies as reasonable and intelligent beings.

To this end I propose that all instruction should, at all events for some time, be conveyed through the medium of the languages to which they are accustomed, viz.—Oordoo and Hindee.

At first, therefore, the teaching will be confined to reading, writing, arithmetic, and moral training; after a certain time elementary education in the more useful sciences can be added, and the standard raised as the pupils progress.

My expectation is, that all those who enter the institution with a view to instruction in the several branches of practical manipulative art, will, also, gladly take advantage of the instruction provided in the school; and, with the view to combine both kinds of education, I would allow them during one portion of the day to attend the several industrial departments, and during the other portion to receive instruction in the school. Arrangements will be made for providing accommodation for all pupils who may come from a distance, on payment of a reasonable rent.

The studies which may be subsequently introduced will be carefully considered in consultation with the Director of Public Instruction and the Officers of the Educational Department.

One of the uses of the Museum will be to aid this school by placing before the eyes of the boys such objects as in the study of natural philosophy may be mentioned or referred to.

With this view the masters will be allowed, under certain restrictions, either to take articles from the collection, or to bring the students into the Museum, at stated times.

As I consider physical activity and the development of the bodily power of infinite importance, I propose to set apart a piece of ground for a gymnasium and playground, and, if possible, to encourage the students to avail themselves of both, and thus acquire manly and active habits.

SCHOOL OF ARTS.

Although the cultivation of art in the higher branches is not one of the urgent wants of society in Behar, a commencement of elementary instruction in these branches will not be premature or unsuited to the capacity and prospects of many of the youths of the province.

If, therefore, masters can be procured, I propose at once to form a small drawing and modelling class, and subsequently extend the instruction to engraving on wood, works of design, photography, &c.

There are many youths about Patna who show a decided capacity for drawing, and who, under good instruction, would make rapid progress.

Architectural and plan drawing might be also profitably taught; but all such details will be the subject of future consideration, and the commencement will depend upon the practicability of procuring teachers.

It is hoped that some of the more advanced pupils of the school in Calcutta or Madras may be qualified to teach the elements of these arts until circumstances admit of more efficient agency.

MUSEUM.

The object of the Museum will be to collect specimens of all the natural products of the province—minerals, earths, medicinal drugs, woods, &c., &c., as well as all manufactured articles of every description, with detailed and accurate information in regard to each.

These will be systematically arranged and classified as they are received; the price and place of manufacture will be affixed to each fabricated article, the place of growth or production to each natural object, while a catalogue will be kept of the whole collection from the commencement.

In process of time, doubtless, contributions will be received from other districts, and a more general and comprehensive collection be amassed.

The practical utility of such a Museum can scarcely be doubted. It will tend to display as well as to develope the resources of the district. Information in regard to all the products and fabrications will be readily obtained by all inquirers, and a subject of rational amusement and intellectual gratification will be at all times available to the students of the institution.

I propose to call upon all the local officers, intelligent natives, planters, and other residents for aid and co-operation in the formation of this collection, and hope that in a very short time it will be replete with interest.

LIBRARY.

In forming a Library my plan will be to purchase at once a few standard works on the principal arts and sciences which appertain to the several branches of instruction in the institution—*i.e.*, agriculture, farming, natural philosophy, agricultural chemistry, &c., &c.

This will form the nucleus of a collection which may, by purchase and donation, be hereafter indefinitely extended.

I would, in the same way, buy a small collection of useful Oriental works, with the same anticipation of future addition.

The Library, like the Museum, will be open on certain conditions to the students of the school, and to such of the public as may be qualified to profit by the use of the books.

I have little doubt that valuable and extensive donations will be made by the friends of education, as the institution becomes known, and I should hope that the Government would contribute copies of any works that may be at their disposal.

INDUSTRIAL DEPARTMENT.

The manipulative dexterity of the natives has ever been a subject of admiration and eulogy, and the wonderful skill displayed in the imitation of European workmanship, even with the most coarse and common tools, is a never-failing source of wonder to the intelligent and observing.

This fact, admitted by all who most differ on other points, has led many to the conclusion that improvement of the tools, patterns, and modes of workmanship would *not* tend to raise the standard of work.

There is some truth and much error in this conclusion.

It may be very true that the native, whose body is as supple as a worm, and who has inherited a readiness of squatting from fifty generations, who can pick up a hammer with his toe and hold a plank between his feet as firmly as in a vice—may not work at a bench, any better with upright back and may be embarrassed

if debarred the use of his nether fingers. But this is no reason that sharper chisels, stronger saws, and more scientific modes of workmanship will not tend to still greater precision and rapidity of execution; that the constant inspection of good models, with instruction in the principles of design and the elements of form, may not (at least, in *some* instances) give the mere servile imitator a higher and more enlarged capacity.

On this principle I intend to establish workshops of every kind; and while I obtain from the hands of the artisans employed all the works required for the establishment, I shall also endeavour gradually to introduce better tools and a better system.

ORPHAN ASYLUM.

The organisation of this institution will afford an excellent opportunity for the establishment of a charitable orphan asylum.

The object of this asylum will be to afford food, shelter, and sound practical instruction to as many orphans and destitute children as the funds will admit of; and it is believed that such an establishment will offer an appropriate channel for Christian charity.

If the majority of English residents in the districts within this division consent to aid this scheme, even by a small monthly contribution, an ample provision may be made for hundreds of children who would otherwise be brought up to misery, starvation, or crime.

The proposal is that a certain number of cottages should be built for the accommodation of the children, that they should receive suitable food and clothing, under proper superintendence, and, when their ages admit of it, that they should obtain instruction in the several departments of useful knowledge, adapted to their capacities, and thus become useful and contented members of the community.

Such an establishment would be a token to the world, that in the midst of our abundance we are not unmindful of the children of affliction, while, at the same time, the systematic devotion of the funds to a specific object will secure a greater amount of practical and permanent good than any separate or isolated efforts of benevolence could possibly achieve.

I must not omit to point out that, with an institution of the character above indicated—with every description of instruction available—with workshops, farm, schools of industry, agriculture, and art—a library and museum for reference and illustration—the whole establishment sustained by a liberal income, and each department efficiently supervised—a machinery will be in existence admirably adapted for training up a body of teachers in every branch of general knowledge and useful industry, to meet the demands of the Education Department. Schools are now being established by the rajahs and zemindars under my superintendence in all the districts of the division, and it is of the utmost importance that teachers should be trained to undertake the management of them.

A central Normal School might be established in connection with this institution, and if stipends be offered to the candidates while under instruction, and an assurance be given that on their obtaining a diploma they will have a preferential title to employment—this desirable end will be secured, and a body of men may eventually be sent out qualified to teach in the common Vernacular Schools or in branch Industrial Schools similar to the parent establishment.

WILLIAM TAYLER,
Commissioner of Patna.

Patna, 1856.

MEETING AT THE WESTMINSTER PALACE HOTEL, TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1871.

E. B. EASTWICK, Esq., C.B., M.P., F.R.S., IN THE CHAIR.

Address by Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE, Bart., M.P.,

On the subject of a Ship Canal between India and Ceylon.

CHAIRMAN.—I have here a letter from Mr. McNeil, in which he says that he is unable to attend in consequence of a pre-engagement; and I would also say, just before I ask Sir James Elphinstone to address the meeting, that we are not going to listen to a mere theorist, but to a gentleman who is practically acquainted with this subject, and who was Chairman of a Committee of the House of Commons, which sat in 1862, to inquire into this subject, and who has also visited the locality, with which he is perfectly acquainted. I would say, with regard to the locality, that it is one of the most interesting in the Eastern Seas. It is most interesting to scientific men, because it is the spot which shows that Ceylon was once joined to the Continent of India, and it is interesting to the people of India as being the scene of what I may call the Hindoo Odyssey—it joins Ceylon to Rameseram, and it is the spot from which Rama is supposed to have gone across to recover his wife in Ceylon. It is also the most southern spot of Hindoo pilgrimage. Hindoo pilgrimage begins a little west of Simla, and then goes round at the foot of the Himalaya Mountains to Hirdwar, and so comes down to Point Calimere, which is the southern point of Madras. Now I will ask Sir James Elphinstone to address the meeting.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE.—Ladies and Gentlemen: The remarks I shall address to you will not be in the form of a paper, because I am quite unaccustomed to draw up any such formal document; but I will touch upon the general points with regard to this undertaking, which I have had in view for a great many years. It was first brought to my notice in Ceylon, when I went out to India in the year 1842, for the purpose of sport and travel over the southern part of India, having previously, for many years, been in the East India Company's service, and having commanded one of their ships, so that I am pretty well acquainted with the coasts of India.

In 1838, Mr. Stewart Mackenzie, then Governor of Ceylon, in consequence of the development of those coffee speculations which have turned out so advantageously in that country, found that a supply of rice from Tanjore was difficult to be obtained, in consequence of the obstruction of the Paumben Channel, and I think it was in 1838 that Sir Arthur Cotton met Captain Dawson, one of the best engineers, I

suppose, there ever was in the East—one of the Duke of Wellington's most favourite men in that branch of the profession—who went out to Ceylon with Sir Edward Barnes, and constructed the Candy-road and other great works which have made Ceylon one of the first colonies under the Crown. Sir Arthur Cotton was sent down by the Madras Government to meet Captain Dawson, the result of which was that they cleared out the channel, which then only had seven feet of water in it, and through which annually some 17,000 tons of freight were carried. That was cleared out to ten feet, at an expense of about 13,000*l.*; and from that time to this the trade has increased in the most marvellous degree, and the whole of the rice which is consumed in the Island of Ceylon and other commodities is now brought down through the Paumben Channel, and last year there were not less than 86,000 passengers who came down in that direction. The channel is named the Paumben Channel in consequence of its being in a crooked form. "Paumben" is the Tamil name for a snake, and the present channel would be inapplicable to the ships of the present time, because no long ship, as many gentlemen present can understand, can easily get through a crooked channel, especially if the current runs in any way across the channel, as it does in this case. The only two places in the Suez Canal at all dangerous to ships are where there is a slight curve. I shall come to that presently.

Now, Sir, here is the line of rocks and shoals which is called Adam's Bridge, and this is the Island of Manaar which belongs to the colony of Ceylon. The Ceylon territory ends at this point. [Pointing to the map.] From there there is a line of rocks and shoals extending for about twenty-five miles to the Island of Rameseram, which, as your Chairman has just told you, is one of the most holy places in India, according to the religion of the natives, and where there is a most beautiful and large temple. Rameseram is in the Madras Presidency. It is divided from the Province of Madura by a narrow strait about a mile long. There is a row of rocks or boulders exactly like stepping-stones, which are supposed to have been the means by which Adam got across to the Island of Ceylon; but they lie at a height of about eight feet out of the water, and I believe they are sandstone. I believed they were the erratic glacial boulders which exist over the South of India, and in such numbers over the whole Island of Ceylon; but I found that they were of sandstone formation, and that they were quite flat at the top. Those extended across to the Island of Rameseram. By lifting a few of those stones and blowing up others a passage was immediately effected, and the current, which generally turned down through Palk's Straits, kept the channel perfectly clear, but it is a crooked channel. I should first explain that along the whole of this coast from Tuticorin, the

whole coast is faced by a line of islands connected by sandbanks. The surf breaks upon the outer part of these, and inside there is a smooth water channel, which I have navigated in a native vessel, by which you sail, as it would appear, in a lake with the islands outside of you, and the mainland inside of you. You sail up there and through the Paumben Channel.

What is proposed now to be done is to cut, for 250 yards, through the sandbank here, which gives access to a harbour of sixteen square miles of anchoring water, of from twenty-four to thirty-six feet, perfectly smooth and land-locked; and then to cut a channel through this point [pointing to the map], the Point of Tonitory, in the district of Madura, which gives you immediate access to Palk's Straits. According to the calculations I have received the expense would amount to something like 90,000*l.*, and it could be kept clear at a comparatively small amount. The benefit of that would be that ships coaling there would either coal in the canal or coal at jetties outside, but the harbour would be as smooth as a mill-pond at all times.

Now, Gentlemen, that leads me to the physical geography of the Gulf of Manaar. Some twenty years ago, when the cotton districts of Tinnivelly became very productive, the cotton began to be shipped at the harbour of Tuticorin, which is a wild, open roadstead, where ships cannot come within five miles of the shore, and where cotton is shipped with considerable difficulty; but nevertheless there were 117,000 bales of cotton shipped there, and the trade is increasing annually. The Government of India are bringing a railway down from Madura, which lies forty miles from here to Tuticorin. A branch from that would bring the whole of the cotton to this little harbour.

Now we come to the physical geography of the Gulf of Manaar and of Palk's Straits, which is a very important point in this question. Here is Cape Comorin, and from Cape Comorin up the Malabar coast there is a range of mountains, ending in sharp, isolated peaks near Cape Comorin. On the mainland of Ceylon lies another range of mountains, the mountains in Ceylon rising to something like 8,000 feet, and the mountains in the Travancore district to something like 6,000 feet. There is the south-western monsoon, as you are aware, in this direction, which blows strongly into the Gulf of Manaar; but when it has got into the Gulf of Manaar it deflects in each direction, and precipitates its rains most severely upon the mountains of Sassagan, in the Island of Ceylon, in one direction, while the other is carried up over Cape Comorin, and the rain falls upon the mountains of Travancore, so that when you have a fall of something like 120 inches here [pointing to the map], and probably of 200 here in the Island of Ceylon, you have here a rainless

region—you have at Cape Comorin and along this coast a rainless region. At Jaffna, and all along here, there is very little rain as far as Chilaw; then the rain breaks upon it there, and breaks upon it here. [Pointing to the map.] The consequence is that the navigation of the Gulf of Manaar, so far from being a dangerous navigation, is a navigation of land and sea breezes; the swell from the Southern Ocean coming up from the south-western monsoon breaks upon the surf along this range of islands here, but there is no wind—or very little wind. In Palk's Strait it is the same. Palk's Bay—which was called Palk's Bay after a Dutch Governor of Ceylon of that name—is practically a lake. There is a passage in here around Point Calimere of six or seven miles wide into Palk's Bay, with no danger except the two and a half fathom patch here. There is a line of shoal across here which forms a complete breakwater, and the consequence is, that when you sail into Palk's Bay you sail practically into a lake. The soundings are perfectly regular the whole way across; the current runs to the southward and runs pretty strongly through here, but it is not charged with sand or detritus of any description, and the alteration of the banks since 1838, since the time that they have been observed, has not been very great. With regard to the saving in distance, we take a common point in the eight-degree channel, between the Maidive and the Laccadive Islands. In the centre of that channel is the Island of Meddicoy, which is commonly made by ships bound to the coast of Ceylon from Aden. Taking the distance from that point here, and Caripal, which is the common point where a ship coming round would meet a ship coming from the other direction, the distance is 360 miles in favour of the Paumben Channel, instead of going round by the southern end of Ceylon.

In considering the question in reference to the Suez Canal, which is the real ground upon which I am now bringing the matter before this meeting, we must take into consideration that the whole of our East Indian trade has probably been revolutionised by the opening of the Suez Canal. The ships in which we placed so much pride, and in which so many of us have spent so many years of our life, and look back to with such satisfaction and pride, are improved off the face of the earth. Trade with India, whether right or wrong, must fall into steam trade. (Hear, hear.) Within the course of the next three or four years, you will see a class of ships built expressly for the purpose of carrying on that trade. (Hear, hear.) The high and low pressure boiler has so completely revolutionised the expense of navigation that you can now, I am told, navigate a ship on equal terms either by sails or steam. But, setting that aside altogether, even if the difference was greater, it is absolutely certain that the whole trade to India must become a steam

trade. Under these circumstances, when you consider that by this work, which really is nothing more than a bit of child's play, when you consider works of the same kind—when you consider that there will be a saving of 720 miles upon each voyage to Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, or wherever a ship may be going to—that is a very great point, because the saving of 720 miles in a voyage of that sort is something like 4 per cent. upon the time and upon the expense; and where profits are so narrow as they are now-a-days, a saving of 4 per cent. cannot be said to be a very indifferent matter.

But you must take into consideration, in looking at this question, that if you continue to circumnavigate Ceylon, you will have to consider what you are to do with the harbour of Galle. Now the harbour of Galle is one of the worst harbours I have ever been in. It is full of rocks; it is exposed to the full swell of the Southern Ocean; it is liable to rollers which set up at any time, without any warning, or without any apparent cause; the probable cause of the rollers being something that has gone on hundreds and hundreds of miles away. All of a sudden you find the ships tossing about without any ostensible reason whatever. There is a great difficulty in coaling and anchoring, which is at present of very small extent, and the impossibility of increasing which, except at an enormous cost, has impressed itself so strongly upon the Government, that I am informed upon the very best authority they have entirely given up their intention of doing anything with the harbour of Galle. That being the case, I think in the month of December something like forty ships went into the harbour of Galle in excess of the ordinary steam trade. The consequence was a very great difficulty in anchoring, and I am not at all sure—in fact, I think it is very likely—that if the harbour of Galle is over-pressed, there may be some very great disaster; because in these rollers if one ship gets adrift and falls foul of another, she may get adrift also, and the consequences may be very disastrous. But that you have the means of entirely obviating by adopting this channel. The cost of the improvement of Galle harbour, which was to be spread over a number of years, was something like half a million of money; and it is my belief, looking at Alderney and Portland, and the experience which we have in this country in moving in deep-water harbour works, that probably a million or a million and a half of money would not have been sufficient to have produced the results desired at Galle, and that not under a very considerable number of years, while it would be perfectly easy in a very few months to carry out what is necessary here.

Now, Sir, there were various objections raised in the Committee over which I had the honour to preside in 1862, the report of which I

have before me; but they were all of such a frivolous and puerile character, that I will not at this moment detain the meeting by alluding to them. I am not surprised that objections were raised, because at the time that Tuticorin was first adopted as a cotton port there was no insurance office at Bombay, or in India, that would insure a ship going into the Gulf of Manaar. At that time there was a supposititious line drawn across here (from Cape Comorin to Colombo), and anybody going inside of it was supposed to go into a place so completely beset with rocks and shoals, that no insurance could cover him. That is a fact, and I remember the difficulty. In 1835 or 1836, a survey was sent there, under Captain Ethersey and Captain Powell, to investigate these dangers, and the danger turned out to be *nil*. The first person who directed my attention to bringing this matter forward was Captain Ethersey, who surveyed it, and whose chart is now before you. I met him going home from Bombay in 1844, and we went up the Nile together, and had a great deal of conversation upon that and other matters. It was not my good fortune to get into Parliament until some two years afterwards, but as soon as I did, one of the first things I did was to apply myself to this matter, and endeavour, if possible, to persuade the Government to deepen the channel to 26 feet, which was perfectly easy. At that time the size or length of our ships was nothing like what it is now, and the old channel might have done; but the crooked nature of the old channel, as I mentioned before, was such that it is absolutely necessary now to turn to some other point, if the thing is to be done, and to get a straight cut right through, as the dangers, as I explained, of a crooked channel are very great. It is quite impossible for any private individual to force a matter of this sort upon the Government; and it is a very extraordinary thing, but when the East India Company ceased, and the Government of India was adopted by the Crown, the first thing they did was to give up their marine establishments and the whole management of the harbours in India, and the service was committed to the Admiralty. The Admiralty, since that time, have done purely nothing whatever, and the consequence is, that this matter has remained in abeyance till this time. And, therefore, what I should propose here is, seeing my friend, Sir Thomas Bazley, here, and other gentlemen who are very much interested in this matter, that they should interest the Chambers of Commerce in England in this question. All I can do is simply—as a sailor, who has happened to have been there and seen the place myself, which very few people have seen—to testify that, as far as my knowledge goes, there is no nautical difficulty; and my friend, Sir Arthur Cotton, will tell you that there is no engineering difficulty. I will just before I sit down—

after making that suggestion, that this matter should be sent up to the Chambers of Commerce in England—I will read you a paragraph from a letter which I received from Captain Donnan, the Master Attendant at Colombo, who I believe at this moment knows more of the navigation of these Palk's Straits and the Paumben Channel than any man alive; because he commanded the colonial steamer Pearl for three years, and during that time he not only had to look after the Pearl, but had to make twelve journeys every year to carry the Chief Justice on his trips, so that he was perfectly aware of the circumstances. On the 31st October last year, he writes to me: "The publication of the proceedings of the Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into this matter, of which you were chairman at the time when I commanded the Ceylon Government steamer Pearl, and frequently passed through Paumben in voyages round Ceylon, first brought the subject prominently to my notice, and ever since that time I have paid particular attention to the various objections that have been raised as to the difficulties and dangers vessels would have to contend with in adopting that route, and I must confess I never met with any of them. My own experience, which extended over three years' navigation of the Gulf of Manaar and Palk Straits, only led me to the conclusion that there is no easier or safer navigation to be found anywhere in the world; and I believe that my experience will be borne out by the fact that although a number of native craft are constantly passing through these seas, accidents very seldom occur to any of them." In reference to that, I may state that 2,200 vessels passed through Paumben Channel last year, and only two vessels were lost, and that 89,000 passengers came down in those ships. The rice trade amounted to some 1,700,000*l.* in value, and those are all carried in vessels with a draught of water of under ten feet. Now only suppose what the tonnage would be—the tonnage last year was 220,000 tons. I have a report before me of the harbour of Kurrachee, upon which the Government of India have agreed to spend 300,000*l.* Now I think it is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel when they lay out 300,000*l.* at Kurrachee, which no doubt is a most important place, but will not spend one shilling upon Paumben. The trade of Kurrachee last year was 111,798 tons, and that in large vessels; the trade of Paumben was 220,000 tons. Now by all means the more the Government of India lay out in harbour works the better I should like them; but I think that we are seeing a great change which is likely to take place, and which has taken place in part, in fact, in the trade of India. I think that if the commercial bodies of this country would take this matter up, the Government might be pressed in such a manner as to expend the very small sum of money which will be necessary to afford

an amount of improvement and a facility to the commerce of England which I do not think will be rightly appreciated until it is carried out.

Mr. WILLIAM TAYLER proposed that on the present occasion the limitation of ten minutes should not be enforced in regard to those speakers who were practically acquainted with the subjects under discussion.

The proposal was adopted by the meeting.

Sir ARTHUR COTTON.—I shall take the liberty of speaking upon this subject a little at length, because it is my own first child. He is fifty years old now, and he has not yet quite come to years of discretion; but I can assure you it is a very promising boy. Still it is almost exactly fifty years ago since I was sent for my first duty to examine and report upon the Paumben Pass. They had a queer way of doing things in those days, as they have now. They sent a boy who knew nothing about either land or sea to report upon the Paumben Pass. However, that brought the matter before me, and it has been repeatedly, at intervals, before my mind from that time to this. I have been sent down by Government five or six times to the place at different periods. In 1852 I was sent there and ordered to report upon it. There was then a very narrow, winding passage, four and a half feet deep, and it took sometimes three or four days for a doney (a flat coasting vessel) to pass through. She had to unload on one side, and tranship her cargo into boats and pass through. Sometimes she would have out five warps in order to get through the bends in the channel. The whole coast trade was confined in that way, on account of this channel, to vessels of this class, which could not work to windward, and one of the consequences was that they were constantly blown off the coast and the crew left to starve in the Bay of Bengal, being utterly unable to fetch up again. Many vessels were lost in that way. In the year 1828 the tonnage was 17,000 tons a-year. I will just mention these facts to show what the effect of these miserable petty improvements, that twenty years later made, has been. In 1849 it had increased from 17,000 to 140,000, and from 1849 to the present time (twenty years more) it had increased to 220,000, about fourteen times what it was when we began. I may just mention one point which is a constant stumbling-block about these improvements in transit. People calculate what they ought to do by the present traffic. There is no connection whatever between the present traffic upon any line and what there will be when facilities are given for it. It has nothing whatever to do with it. Suppose we had based our ideas of the improvement of the passage upon the 17,000 tons traffic there was then, and had taken no cognisance of what the effect of our improvements would have been—namely, raising it up to 220,000. In that time, during

these forty years, I reckon that 5,000,000 tons have passed through that passage. A few days ago, when this subject was discussed in the House, the Under-Secretary of State said: "If we make a new passage, we shall have thrown away all the money that we have spent." Now, in the first place, it is a very curious argument to use, that when we have made a mistake we must not correct it, for fear we should find out that we were wrong before. But in the next place is it nothing that we have facilitated the passage of 5,000,000 of tons through that passage for the most insignificant sum (I do not think the whole sum has been expended) of 40,000*l.*?

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE.—36,000*l.* is the whole outlay.

Sir ARTHUR COTTON.—That is at the expense of about 1½d. per ton. And that money has been thrown away! Now, I will just give you the history of these works. It is profitable to consider these things. I was sent out first in 1822, and then the Government took six years to consider of it. In 1828 I was sent back, with permission to spend 200*l.* or 300*l.*, and with twenty or thirty sappers to help me. With these we straightened the passage, or made it almost straight, and took away the great bends, and deepened the water to five or six feet. Then they considered seven years more, and in 1839, by dint of sheer perseverance, General Menteith worried the Government till, for the sake of their own peace, they gave him the monstrous sum of 400*l.* This was all that was spent for another seven years, and then in the year 1845 they had succeeded in getting 9,000*l.*; but by this time they had a straight, good, and safe passage of eight or nine feet of water. It was about this time that my friend behind me (General Collier) was called in; and one of the papers we now have to assist us in this matter was his valuable report made at the time. Now, I have looked at the plans that Sir James Elphinstone has obtained of this place. I may just mention that I urged at that time that, instead of improving the natural passage which there now is, they should cut through the point of land where there was tolerably deep water on each side, within about a mile or three-quarters of a mile of the present passage; but I did not examine it further at that time. I am entirely satisfied with the plans and reports now produced by Sir James Elphinstone as to the proper place, that it should be made where there is deep water on both sides, and where a clear channel can be cut for vessels of any draught of water, by cutting through the land for a mile and a half, besides about half a mile on each side, which would require to be deepened. Upon the south side of this there is as fine a harbour, certainly the finest harbour that could be found in India, the most complete and the most unobjectionable. The estimate, which I have looked over, was 90,000*l.* I should mention that the substance

we have to cut through consists either of sand or of very soft sandstone or dead coral. The sandstone is in thin layers; but there is no sign of any hard rock anywhere in that direction that I saw, and I am therefore persuaded that not the slightest difficulty will be found in cutting through it. The estimate provides for a channel 100 yards broad; there is no object that I can see whatever in having a channel 100 yards broad. If 100,000 tons passed through it, and the average tonnage of the vessels was 1,000 tons, there would be 1,000 vessels a-year; that is to say, 500 vessels each way, or about three in two days each way. Therefore they would very seldom meet indeed, the passage being only a mile and a half long, and if they did they would only have to wait about twenty minutes. I should therefore reduce the breadth, probably to 200 or 180 feet; therefore the estimate is certainly more than sufficient. We must allow, certainly, in all such estimates, a sum for contingencies—the officer who estimated it allowed 15,000*l.* out of the 90,000*l.*, but I think, on the whole, we could be perfectly safe in saying that the work could be executed for under 80,000*l.*, it being done by an intelligent engineer. I do not mean to say that we may not spend any amount of money upon engineering work if we choose to do so—they have spent 20,000*l.* a-mile upon a single line of railway from Calcutta to Delhi, with one tunnel a thousand yards long. Of course you may spend any amount of money in that way, but I am speaking of the work being done with ordinary intelligence and fairness. Now about the total traffic. The total traffic between Calcutta and Madras is 2,000,000 tons; out of this about three-fourths come to Europe and North America. That would be 1,500,000 tons. The whole of that traffic ought to go through this passage, therefore the present traffic would allow for 1,500,000 tons through this passage. A considerable part of this goes round the Cape at present, but it will be rapidly transferred to the Suez line, that is certain. But that is the present traffic. What the traffic is going to be now the Suez Canal is opened it is impossible to calculate; it will develop in a most astonishing way, that I am sure of. Then the present little petty coasting traffic is 200,000 tons, and adding that to the traffic from Calcutta and Madras would make it 1,700,000. If we allow for present traffic, and take 80,000*l.* as the cost of the work, the actual expense per ton, allowing seven per cent. upon the capital—that is to say, for the cost of management—will come to about 1½d. per ton, that is to say, a toll of 1½d. a-ton, would cover the expense of the vessels making use of it. The distance saved is 360 miles, which, at the lowest estimate, is equivalent to 1s. a-ton, so that the vessel, on paying a toll of 1½d., would save 1s. a-ton. I just state these things to give some idea of what the nature of the case is, because, you see, looking at that speech

that I was speaking of in the House of Commons, the other day, upon this subject, there was not a single tangible point in it. Nobody could have made out from the speech whether 100,000 or 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 tons would make use of it; whether the saving would be a shilling or a farthing a-ton. Nobody could say what was the basis of the argument that was used. Now France has most gallantly made us a present of the Suez Canal. What a shame it is to England!—really sometimes I wonder how Englishmen can look one another in the face when they think of that Suez Canal. Only think of almost every man in England having opposed that work! France comes with an immense sum of money and executes this magnificent work for our benefit—that work which connects the two halves, the black and the white half, of the British Empire together—executed by a foreign country, and all of us not only standing still, but writing everything that could be imagined against it in every newspaper in England. Surely after this we might at least cut through a mile and a half of land to complete the communication with Calcutta, at an expense of 90,000*l.*, when France has spent 18,000,000*l.* for us! So with respect to another work with reference to the completion of the communication between London and Calcutta, I understand the French are now talking of making us another present—it is certainly under discussion; I do not know how far it has been carried at present—that is, to complete the Burgundy Canal from the Bay of Biscay to the Gulf of Lyons for a ship canal, and thus save us 800 miles more to Calcutta. They talk of doing that, and very likely they will do it, and we shall be great gainers by it. Now, what an insignificant thing it is for England to spend 80,000*l.* or 90,000*l.* upon this line in order to help forward the communication between London and Calcutta. I may just mention, with respect to the money being thrown away upon these Straits, that the money actually paid in tolls to the Government is 34,000*l.*—exactly the sum that they have cost the Government; so that the Government have not laid out a farthing to this day upon this Paumben Straits. I may also just mention that, with the assistance of this canal, I reckon that the distance from London to Calcutta will be 7,700 miles; and I am informed that they now find that, except for very long lines, the ordinary speed for large steamers at sea is 10 miles an hour, or 240 a-day; and at that rate, therefore, the time from London to Calcutta would be 32 days for ordinary steam traffic—about the same, or rather under, the speed at which the mails are carried by the Peninsular and Oriental Company, with a subsidy of half a million. Now, in connection with that subject, I would just mention that what I would propose is, that the Secretary of State should be earnestly pressed to appoint a Committee, with Sir James Elphinstone

at the head of it—I am quite sure we could not find a man more fitted for it—to report upon the line of communication between London and Calcutta, and lay before the Government an estimate, and to do whatever could be done to facilitate the communication, which has now become of such commercial importance to this country. It really seems a shame that all this fuss should have to be made about such an insignificant sum as this 80,000*l.* or 90,000*l.* for England to lay out to connect Calcutta and London. There is no comparison in the world between the value of the thing and the cost of it. As I said, it certainly would not amount to above 1½d. a-ton for vessels making use of it at present, and in a very few years that will be reduced to a half or one-third of that sum. I do not think there is any other point that I can speak to. I have been rather diffuse upon it; but it has really been such a child of mine all my life, having been the very first thing I had my attention called to, that I trust you will excuse my dilating upon it at such length. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Robert Carlyle.—If the meeting would allow me, as a stranger, to make a suggestion, I would suggest that, if the Government will not pay the money, they should grant a toll to those who will make it, and I think there is quite enough enterprise in this country to effect it.

Chairman.—That is a very good suggestion, but I really think it is the duty of the Government itself to do it.

Mr. Robert Carlyle.—So it is; but my suggestion gives them the alternative. If you will not do it, do not be a dog in the manger. I may say that my firm are building a large line of steamers to pass through the canal, and we mean to make use of that place; and if the Government say they will not make it, and they will only tell us that, I will find people who will make the canal, if they will allow us to take sixpenny toll for passing through it, and that is four times what it would cost us to make it.

Mr. J. B. Smith, M.P.—I had the honour of serving upon the Committee of which Sir James Elphinstone was the Chairman upon the passage of Adam's Bridge, and certainly the evidence was such that the marvel is that the Government could refrain from making this small outlay. Now, supposing it cost 100,000*l.*, I have contended over and over again in the House of Commons that the Government may execute works of this kind without their costing them one farthing, and I have instanced the case repeatedly of the Ohio River, in America, where there is a ridge of rocks which necessitated the stoppage of the steamer when it got to a certain point, and of carrying the produce and the freight of the steamer round the rocks to reload them on the other side. The State of Ohio saw that that was a great inconvenience. They had it surveyed,

and determined to make a canal round the rocks. That canal was made. The State borrowed the money and made use of their credit, and it did not cost them one farthing, as the tolls upon the canal were sufficient to pay principal and interest upon the whole money. The traffic was increased so enormously by this convenience that it was soon found that the canal was too small, and then they set to work to enlarge it, and borrowed money for the purpose of enlarging this canal, and making it so large that now steamers of the largest size can pass through the canal and the tolls have been sufficient to pay the debt off again. I say, if America can do it, why cannot India do it; and my belief is that if the Government are disposed to enter into this work and borrow 100,000*l.* to do so, the tolls would be sufficient to pay off both principal and interest, and by and by ships might go by for a mere nominal toll, just sufficient to keep the canal in repair. I hope Sir James Elphinstone will press upon the Government these facts, and the importance of making these facts known. When we sat upon Committee to consider this question, the Suez Canal was not contemplated, nobody thought of making it; but since that time the Suez Canal has been made, and this therefore renders it far more valuable than it was before. I should be very happy to join in any representations to Government, and I hope that Sir James Elphinstone, having taken up this matter with great spirit for so many years, will not let it drop and remain in its present state.

Captain TAYLOR.—I was examined by the Parliamentary Committee upon this question of the Paumben Channel, and the inference that I drew from the report was simply that it was not much use deepening the old channel, and that the locality selected for a new deep channel, through the Island of Rameseram, was not quite the right thing. But the place which Sir James Elphinstone has spoken of this evening seems to my mind nearer the mark. Only the same may be said now as had to be said then, that we have not sufficient recorded information of the depth of water on the old charts. I endeavoured to bring before the Parliamentary Committee that the most important thing, in the first instance, was a thorough survey of the locality, but nothing came of the suggestion, and the report seems to have shared the fate of the old Indian Navy—they were both put upon the shelf together about nine years ago, and have been there ever since. I have looked into the case a good deal myself, and I feel persuaded that somewhere in the locality pointed out by Sir James Elphinstone is the very place for a harbour, upon the south side; and that there is no great impediment upon the north side of Ramnâd Promontory—that North Bay is simply like the Bay of Pelusium, and we may expect nothing worse in Ramnâd North

Bay than in the Bay of Pelusium. With regard to the present Paumben Passage, my impression is that it cannot be deepened to 15 feet; for if they deepened the Horse-shoe Channel to that extent, it would be simply like counter-sinking a hole there, because the water outside is much shoaler, only 12 or 13ft. Then that other proposed cutting through Rameseram, which was spoken of before the Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons, had this objection, that the south entrance of it opened right out into the Gulf of Manaar and dead in the teeth of the south-west monsoon. I thought that was a great objection. But the third proposition, brought forward this evening by Sir James Elphinstone, was not mentioned then, and now seems to me to invite the attention of all parties. Before I sit down the only thing to be said is this—I do not think we want another inquiry. What is wanted is simply to examine the place. There has been inquiry enough, in my mind, but action certainly is wanted. I might say that the Government do not seek to spend much upon the present Paumben Passage. We have heard of the small sums that were spent in former days, and in the years 1869 and 1870 the outlay was 200*l.*, in endeavouring to deepen the channel to 14 feet, but it silts up again.

Sir JOHN HAY.—I am very anxious to keep well within the ten minutes, but I wish to say that I had the honour of serving on that Committee of the House of Commons of which Sir James Elphinstone was Chairman, and of which my honourable friend on my left was also a member. I have heard the speech of the honourable and gallant gentleman who has just spoken with very great pleasure, because there was a unanimity among the witnesses before that Committee for the necessity of the opening of this communication, I think, of a very singular character; and the only strong evidence, if I may so call it, that appeared to go against it, and which came with very great weight from an officer of the Indian Navy, was the evidence of Captain Taylor, who has just addressed the meeting; and we have now the advantage of hearing from him that the objections which he took, and fairly took, with regard to the proposals which were at that time before the Committee for deepening the original Paumben Pass, or for cutting through Rameseram, are now obviated entirely by the fresh proposition now before the meeting of the ship canal proposed to be cut through this point in the Madras territory; and we have the highest authority, as I may justly call it, in Indian matters of Sir Arthur Cotton, who has explained to the meeting the points of the case. When we find the great objector, Captain Taylor, and the great advocator, Sir Arthur Cotton, agreeing upon this point, as being the point which is desired, there is nothing further that can be desired for you in the chair than to accept the evidence which has been

given, and to take, I might almost say, the sense of the meeting as to the necessity of the work put before us by Sir James Elphinstone. Sir Arthur Cotton has kindly gone into a great many details as to the saving of expense, but I think the saving of expense might be put at a much less figure than he has put it at. I think 1s. for 360 miles each way, steaming, would hardly cover the coal expenditure in the winds and seas which are experienced in that locality. I think the saving might be looked upon as being very much more than the 4½d. a-ton, which has been mentioned by Sir Arthur Cotton, although that is very considerable, and I think I might almost ask him to concede to me that even a greater saving might possibly be expected. There are various ways, I imagine, in which money might be obtained. At this present moment a very great national undertaking is being completed in these seas by means of money advanced in this country by the Public Works Loan Commissioners for great undertakings. I allude to the lighthouse which is now being erected upon the Basses, which are dangerous rocks upon the East coast of Ceylon. I am myself a Public Works Loan Commissioner, and I know that money, 70,000*l.* or 80,000*l.*, was advanced for the purpose of building that lighthouse, by arrangements which are perfectly familiar to all those who obtain money for public works from that channel. The only question which it seems, perhaps, might be raised—unless, perhaps, as Mr. Carlyle suggested, it might be done by private enterprise—would be as to which Government, the Government of Ceylon or the Madras Government, should be at first responsible. It is quite clear that whichever is at first responsible would very soon be recouped; but I think the financial difficulty might be got over by the Government of India. The Government of India, being a richer Government than the Government of Ceylon, might easily undertake the necessary security by which the money might be advanced, and this great and important work, both to Europe and to America and to India, might be at once completed. It is discreditable to this country, as I have already pointed out, that France should have completed the Suez Canal in spite of all the opposition thrown upon it; but it would be doubly discreditable if we should hesitate to expend this paltry sum of money upon this undertaking, when it must be the desire of every one to complete the communication between this country and India, and to develop our wealth and power in the East.

Mr. Tayler, after adverting to the ancient Hindoo tradition of Rama and the monkey Hunooman, who made a bridge of trees and rocks between Ceylon and the continent, then said: What is this plan now before us?—a trifling expenditure of 90,000*l.* to convert a dangerous, difficult, and expensive channel of communication into one that will be

safe and commodious; a work productive of the greatest possible advantage to the rising commerce of the world. When we compare this with the work of the energetic Hunooman I think we ought to take very great shame to ourselves that we have so far degenerated from those whom it is the fashion among some philosophers of the present day to consider as our progenitors—the monkeys. But, passing from those times of fable, I would submit to you, Sir, the extremely satisfactory nature of the present short discussion. Here we have laid before us by Sir James Elphinstone, upon the strength of his personal experience and great ability, confirmed and strengthened by Sir Arthur Cotton, who, I may safely say, is the greatest living authority at present upon such matters—more particularly when speaking with regard to what he terms his own child—a plan to which nobody has ventured to raise any objection whatever. Engineering difficulty, by common consent, there is none; financial difficulty we ought to be ashamed even to allude to. The advantages are admitted by all to be great. In place of a harbour like Galle, where we have rollers and rocks, both stomachic and material, to the discomfort of the passengers, we are promised a safe harbour. 360 miles will be saved to every ship going and coming from Calcutta, amounting to 720 miles in each voyage to and fro. The expense, as I said, is a trifle. What is there to prevent this great scheme being carried out? What is the ground, what are the arguments of the opposition? Captain Taylor's opposition has most auspiciously been converted into support. We have, therefore, only to look to the opposition which was raised in the House of Commons by Mr. Grant Duff. This, which has been very delicately referred to by Sir James Elphinstone himself, is really too trifling a thing to deserve much consideration. But I would draw the attention of all present to the character of Mr. Grant Duff's arguments, because we may safely say that a gentleman of the great ability of Mr. Grant Duff, being opposed to the scheme, would undoubtedly bring forward, when it was brought before the Government, the most powerful and convincing arguments he could adduce against it. What, then, has been said? Upon reading his speech, I observe two facts stated: one is, that this new passage would not answer for ships of war. Why? Because the ships of war now use the harbour of Trincomalee! That is very much like saying, as an old hackney-coachman might have done forty years ago, "I do not want a railway, because I have got a hackney-coach." We use the harbour of Trincomalee, and, therefore, we do not care to have a better channel. Now, this appears to me one of those puerile arguments which are set up at the moment for the sake of supporting the opposition, and which is really not worth refuting. The next point is,

that if we use this easily-constructed channel, the plan of which lies before us, with its prospects of great commercial improvement—if we do take advantage of it, and spend this little paltry sum of 90,000*l.* to secure it, we shall be throwing away all we have done in dredging out some other little dirty channel. It is really almost too absurd to call such a reason an argument. How Mr. Grant Duff, standing up in the House of Parliament, and in the presence of a large assemblage of intelligent English gentlemen, could use such an argument as that, I cannot conceive. It amounts to this, that there is to be no progress in this world whatever; that if I have been treated by a quack doctor, and spent 20*l.* in paying him for killing me, I am not, when I have the opportunity of procuring the assistance of an able physician, to spend 20*l.* more in employing him to cure me, because the first 20*l.* would be thrown away. Without dwelling more, then, Sir, on these feeble arguments, I would observe that we have a scheme proposed, which it is shown will be of the utmost advantage to England and to India, with no opposition whatever worthy of a name. That is the position of the matter now before us. Under these circumstances, I would wish to propose a resolution. I am not sure whether the rules of this Society exactly contemplate the proposing of a resolution without previous notice; but if that matter of form were to be set aside, I would think it advisable that this discussion should not end as a mere empty debate, but that this Society should propose to take action, in the shape either of a deputation or a petition presented to the Secretary of State, asking his aid to obtain the appointment, as has already been suggested, of a Committee to inquire into the subject, embracing probably the whole question of the communication between London and Calcutta, with a special reference to the proposal which has been now laid before us by Sir James Elphinstone.

Mr. Trelawny Saunders.—Any one who will take the trouble to read Captain Taylor's former evidence, and to compare it with the remarks he has made this evening, will not see the difference, I beg to say, which has been attributed to it by the former speaker. Before the Parliamentary Committee, Captain Taylor's evidence was particularly directed to the Paumben Channel. From that day to this, the Government, although constantly maintaining dredging-vessels in that channel, have never been able to deepen it to the extent of fifteen feet. Captain Taylor has told you this evening a very good reason why that cannot be done, and on that occasion he advocated what he has advocated this evening—the extension of surveys in Palk's Straits and in the Gulf of Manaar, as a preliminary to further operations. The surveys which have hitherto been carried on in these great inlets have been extremely

limited, confined to the narrow margin of the coast; so that while the old charts present us, in the centre of Palk's Straits in particular, with great patches of sandbanks, our recent surveys have never gone to the length of even an examination of those places where those patches were said to exist. In fact, we have only imperfect knowledge of the hydrographic condition of Palk's Straits and of the Gulf of Manaar. But we know that Palk's Strait, so far as our present knowledge goes, is not only greatly encumbered by sandbanks at its mouth, but that it has a great spit of sand running out from a point which is visible upon that chart towards the north point of the Island of Ceylon, and another system of sandbanks running out at the entrance of the gulf. And we can easily understand that such is likely to be the case, for that strait is exposed to the violence of the north-east winds which prevail in the Gulf of Bengal for four months in the year. On the other hand, the Gulf of Manaar is exposed, to an extraordinary extent, to the influence of the south-west monsoons—so much so, that it is said the south-west monsoon blows with greater violence in the Gulf of Manaar than in any other part of India. And that may be well understood when you find it to be such a funnel as it is between the two opposite ranges of mountains; so that I can hardly agree with Sir James Elphinstone in drawing that rose-coloured picture which he has done of the facilities of the Gulf of Manaar; and I would say that, in the present state of our knowledge of the Gulf of Manaar, it is not strange that insurers should be rather loth to incur that risk. I do say that it is a disgrace to us that we have remained so long in such ignorance, especially as that ignorance has been so long exposed as it has been. I am not one of those who would attribute this fault altogether to the Government, either of India or of the Crown, when we find the merchants of England, who really are the dominant power in this country, so utterly negligent of their interests as to allow a question of this nature to remain in the condition that it has remained in. The Government of this country is not a despotic Government. It is not like that of the Czar of Russia, a Government which is expected to initiate everything. The Government of this country is not expected to initiate; but, as far as it goes, it is certainly in advance of our merchants. Here is a question of 90,000*l.*, the expenditure of which is essential to the mercantile interest of the country, and yet we remain, to a great extent, in ignorance of the physical conditions under which it is to be expended. Now, instead of the Paumben Passage being advocated, as it was advocated under a former inquiry, the recommendation is that the passage should be made further to the westward. It should be recollected that in the former times the passage of commerce between the Gulf of

Manaar and Palk's Straits took place to the east of the Island of Manaar. It is now removed westward of the Island of Rameseram, and upon that large chart you will find an indication engraved many years since of the very project now proposed to be carried out across the promontory of Ramnâd. There is, then, a general tendency to a movement of this passage to the westward, and I think it may be a fair question whether we have moved far enough west; and whether, considering that a straight passage is of such importance to our navigation, you have got by this movement far enough west to have deep water, a good harbour, and good entrance, at least at the southern extremity, for this entrance is proposed to be made at Vallinoocum Point.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE.—No, not at Vallinoocum Point—at Moosel Island.

Mr. SAUNDERS.—It is very near Vallinoocum Point.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE.—Not within thirty miles.

Mr. SAUNDERS.—Now I think it is a fair question whether it should not be at or near Vallinoocum Point; but I think, if you will examine the narrow passage through which it is proposed that this great increase of shipping should be passed before it gets to the canal, I think it is a fair question whether it would not be better to make the canal twenty miles in length through the low land that lies upon the coast, in preference to threading through the intricate channel, amongst sandbanks, through which it is proposed to form the entrance to this shorter canal. I think it is quite a fair question whether it would not be better to make a longer canal through the mainland further to the westward, than it would be to carry your shipping through the intricate channel, beset with sandbanks, which is now proposed. This is certain, that if the movement is to take place it must be followed at least by better surveys; by proper, suitable, adequate surveys of Palk's Strait and the Gulf of Manaar. And the question, therefore, is, whether it is more fitting that these surveys should be made after you have entered upon this great expenditure, or whether they should be made before. In my opinion, any wise man entering upon such a subject, seeing its importance, and determined to give the greatest facilities to commerce between the Red Sea and Madras, would naturally say, Let us take a broad view of this subject, and investigate its natural conditions fully, and see fully what we are about before incurring further expenditure in the matter. That is not so much a matter of inquiry as the very first step in the matter of action. The first act you make before you proceed to construct is to survey and lay out your plans. I say, Sir, the condition in which the nautical survey of India has been left for the last ten years—that is, since the responsibility of conducting

those surveys has been left to the Admiralty—is really disgraceful; and I beg to say that it is not more disgraceful to the Government of India or to the Government of Great Britain than it is disgraceful to the merchants of Great Britain—those directly interested in keeping up trade with India. They would seem to forget that India is, next to China, the greatest labour market in the world; and that it presents us Englishmen with an opportunity of bringing to bear upon our enterprise a population of 200,000,000. They seem to regard it as nothing but an outlet for the sale of our calico. Instead of being a mere outlet for the sale of our calico, it ought also to be an outlet for its own immense natural products, and one of the greatest feeders of our manufactories, which should return these raw products of India to that country again in the form of manufactured goods. But our merchants appear to take no more prospective interest in what they are about than the mere question of the day imposes upon them. For example, within the last ten years there has been established in India a thorough system of steam coasting trade, and coasting steamers now run periodically at short intervals from Singapore all the way along the shores of India, and through the Persian Gulf, up to Bussorah, upon the River Tigris. But notwithstanding this fact, there is no regular and permanent system of survey upon this much-frequented shore; and therefore I deem it of the utmost importance that the subject of marine surveying in the Indian Ocean should be thoroughly investigated, not only as relating to the Paumben Channel, but also with relation to other questions. Take, for instance, the case of the Orissa famine. The rice ships had difficulties in getting into Chittagong for want of proper surveys; and they had equal difficulty in getting into Cuttack for want of surveys of that port, so that the Government of India had to undertake local surveys on their own hook, in spite of the Admiralty having undertaken to do that work. Again, in Ceylon we have the port of Trincomalee, which in the event of war would be of the greatest importance to us; but so little knowledge have we of that eastern coast of Ceylon, that we are actually persuaded by the best nautical books to avoid it, because we are so ignorant of it. I do say that such a condition of things is one of which we ought to be exceedingly ashamed, and none more so than the merchants of this country.

Sir THOMAS BAZLEY.—I will offer a very few remarks upon the occasion of our meeting this evening. My honourable friend, Sir James Elphinstone, having briefly alluded to me in his very lucid statement, I have very great pleasure in stating that so far as I can be useful in carrying out the hint he has given of increasing the communication between the Chambers of Commerce in this country and this Associa-

tion, I will make myself useful. I think there is great value in that suggestion, because I believe that in the interior of our great country at home where we have very rapid communication upon all subjects, there is great ignorance upon this very question we are here to consider. I think in this room there is no difference of opinion as to the project under our consideration. I think, with the gentleman who has just spoken, it is a reproach to us that that communication has not been made. I deplore with Sir Arthur Cotton that the honour of the Suez Canal has been entirely achieved by the French. I know that M. de Lesseps came to this country twenty-five years ago and obtained very little support, not only from the mercantile classes but from the Government. Lord Palmerston denounced the project as unworthy of our consideration; but that mighty project has been completed now between the Mediterranean and India. We have the industry of this great kingdom now in rapid communication with the great wealth of production in British India. I would say, with reference to some critical remarks which have been made by the last speaker, touching the conduct of British merchants, that I can assert, with considerable force and truth, that just in proportion as India has had intercourse with British merchants, so India has increasingly prospered, and I hope that that intercourse will long be continued, and that, in whatever sphere of action we may be moving, we shall each do our duty. Then there is the spirited remark of Mr. Carlyle, who said that if the Government will not do it, try the money market. 100,000*l.* appears to be a very small sum, and when we subdivide that by 100 persons, I think that 100 gentlemen could be easily found to subscribe 1,000*l.* each to make up the sum required. But it is not a question merely of this link of communication, which I regard as being indispensable, but it is the great question involved—how far this country, and the country of India in particular, shall be engaged in developing the resources of this great country by the aid of public works. There is no doubt the common carrier is the great leveller of traffic; he takes from the district of plenty to the district of scarcity—he reduces extravagant prices, and carries plenty in his train. In the case of the famine in Orissa, there is no doubt but that plenty of rice could have been had to supply the starving people, but the difficulty in India uniformly has been, that where hundreds of thousands have frequently starved for want of food, food in other parts of India has been abundant if it could only have been conveyed from those who had plenty to those who had none. I believe, myself, the principles of commerce embrace that great object of supplying the plenty where abundance exists to those parts of scarcity where necessity is requiring what that superabundance can supply. I only hope, Sir

James Elphinstone, you will put yourself in communication with the various Chambers of Commerce through this Indian Association, and that we shall be able to stir up and call the attention of Government and the commercial communities to the duties that devolve upon each. If this Association could graphically describe the object that is required, I would be happy to communicate myself with the Chambers of Commerce of Lancashire, and I think I could put myself in communication with the representatives in the House of Commons of other Chambers of Commerce in the country, and I think it will not be found to have been in vain, if that course is deemed prudent to be pursued. I only hope that the efforts which are now being made will be crowned with success. I am glad to have attended so excellent a meeting, and I trust that the attention of the English public will be called to India, and, I will add, to English ports.

Mr. ZORN.—I take the liberty to speak as one who has had something to do with harbours of refuge. Four years ago in Malta I had entrusted to me the finishing of the harbour works, which no doubt a number of these gentlemen have seen. The Government advocated the large outlay which those works occasioned on the plea of the making of the Canal of Suez. They were taken in hand in 1861, and are not quite finished even now; but the total outlay will probably amount to 360,000*l*. The chief argument of the Government was this—that from an imperial standpoint it was desirable to change a solid piece of land a mile and a half long and a mile in width into a harbour of twenty-five to thirty feet deep. The French Creek, which was then used as the harbour for mercantile vessels, was claimed by the Government as indispensable for another dry dock, which had to be cut out of the solid rock. The work which was then to be done was done by the outlay of 50,000*l*. upon Government plant alone; and the contractors who were carrying out the work invested another 50,000*l*. in plant, and not merely was a harbour thus artificially created, but it was surrounded by a beautiful quay, built of square blocks. I do not know whether that was necessary for the purpose of giving an anchorage to vessels. The Admiralty seemed to have had a particular liking for excelling in that work, which now can be inspected by any one on his road from England to India. The price which was then paid for the dredging (a little below 4d. a-ton) would, for the quantity of work which the canal proposed by Sir James Elphinstone would involve, amount to 354,000*l*. This is, however, a practical question which could be very easily and satisfactorily settled if tenders were invited for contractors willing to undertake the work, and sending out their own engineers to examine the plans, specifications, and estimates of the

Government engineers, as is usually done, to satisfy themselves both as to the quality and quantity of the stuff that is to be removed. The trade that passes through Malta is certainly not, by a very great distance, to be compared with the trade that would pass through the proposed channel. Therefore, in vouching the Committee that has been proposed, I believe it would strengthen the claims of the proposed canal in a very great measure to keep in view the comparative expenditure already incurred for the same reason (that of increased traffic by steam between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean). It was argued the Suez Canal would necessitate a greater accommodation of the harbour works in Malta. Well, if it has been found necessary to prepare (even before the canal was cut through Egypt) a harbour in the Mediterranean, at the only station we had on this side, it will be found equally necessary to do so upon the other side, where a much larger amount of tonnage is not problematical, but *certain* already.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE.—I should like to say one or two words, in reply to Mr. Saunders' remarks. I think he cannot be aware that perhaps there is no part of India that has been so minutely surveyed as Palk's Bay and the Gulf of Manaar. After Captain Ethersey and Captain Powell's survey was completed, or nearly completed, it was afterwards re-surveyed by Mr. Franklin, who was Deputy Master Attendant at Madras.

Mr. SAUNDERS.—I beg your pardon. Mr. Franklin's work did not proceed over the same ground as the work of other men.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE.—I was there at the time with Mr. Franklin, and I have here a tracing of his work at half an inch to the mile, showing the proposed cutting through the Point of Tonitory, and also showing the course from that proposed cutting inside of the Moosel Island to the Point of Vallinoocum, which Mr. Saunders appears to be well acquainted with. I have been over that course in a native vessel; in fact, I have been twice through the Paumben Pass and through Palk's Straits. It is impossible for anybody to state, I think, with any degree of accuracy, that a sea which is navigated, in the course of the year, by 2,200 vessels is not pretty well known. In fact, when I was in India last year, I communicated upon the subject with the native pilots, and with the native masters of those vessels; they know the whole place just as well as we know this street; and Captain Donnan, who is Master Attendant at Colombo, who commanded the Pearl steamer there for three years, is perfectly and intimately acquainted with the whole place. The original surveys are all in the Government archives out there. I have now got a tracing before me of one of the most minute surveys that could possibly be. I was with Captain Franklin in 1844, when

he was surveying the Jaffna Channel, and he showed me the whole of his work. The lines of soundings were taken across and across the whole way. We know perfectly well about this bank; it is a hard sandbank. All these banks are as well known as Fleet-street, and when I say that 2,200 passages were made through there last year, surely people must know pretty well the navigation of the sea; and they completely maintain that these shoals which are marked in pencil upon these charts are more for the purpose of frightening people than anything else. They do not exist. I got the master of the vessel to keep his lead continually going all the way from Paumben up here to Delf, and right up to Fort Hamlyn, and we never shoaled under ten fathoms. I believe there is not a danger of any description, and I cannot possibly conceive why objections should be put forward to a proposition which in every possible way commends itself so much to the interests of the country. After all, these objections can be very easily disposed of if any one can point out the position where there is a real danger, but I believe these dangers do not exist. I believe no part of India has been so well surveyed. I quite agree with the honourable gentleman that the eastern coast of Ceylon is not so well known as it ought to have been. I have gone in a native vessel up the eastern side also, and there are many dangers that are not very well laid down; but the coast of Manaar has been very closely surveyed. I think I should recommend that the Chambers of Commerce in England, who are the parties most interested in this question, should combine in memorialising the Government, and the Government—having satisfied themselves, as they can very easily do by the reports of competent persons and master attendants upon the coast, such as that Master Attendant at Colombo and others—should advertise to see what the work could be done for. That would put them upon a practical footing, and they could then make a comparison with other public works. We know in Ceylon what a cube yard of stuff can be removed for, and in India it is perfectly well known too; and having these tenders before them, they could very easily find the money for such a work. I am much obliged to the meeting for listening to me with such patience.

CHAIRMAN.—I think the meeting must now have made up its mind. I began by stating to you that you were going to listen to a gentleman who had a most thorough practical acquaintance with this subject, and not to a mere theorist, and I think you will all agree with me that that is the case. I think the meeting are now prepared to adopt the child of Sir Arthur Cotton, or rather, I should say, the child for which Sir James Elphinstone and Sir Arthur Cotton are the sponsors. Mr.

Tayler has so well summed up everything that has been said, that he has left little or nothing for me to do. I will only make one remark, and that is with regard to the harbour at Trincomalee, which is no doubt a very fine harbour when you get into it; but I believe it is very unhealthy, in consequence of a large swamp near it. But, at the point suggested by Sir James Elphinstone, you would be well supplied with provisions from the surrounding country, which is extremely populous. I think it would be quite unnecessary to enter into a new survey or new Committee inquiry. In this survey we have all the depths marked, and as to the Committee inquiry which we had ten years ago, they have not taken another step since. We heard from Sir Arthur Cotton how the Government proceeded in the very beginning of this business—how it laid out 250*l.*, and then went to sleep for six years, and then laid out 400*l.*, and then went to sleep for another seven years. I think it would be very desirable to adopt the suggestion of my honourable friend, and to get the Associated Chambers of Commerce to take up this subject; but, in the meantime, I think it is very desirable that there should be a deputation from the East India Association to the Secretary of State for India upon the subject. I would now ask the meeting whether it is not desirable that the Gulf of Manaar and Palk's Straits should be connected by the passage recommended by Sir James Elphinstone, and that Government should be pressed at once to adopt steps to carry out that scheme. It is not for me, as Chairman, to propose or second that, but if anybody will do it I should be glad.

Mr. TAYLER.—I beg to propose the following resolution, which is in substance what I had before suggested: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is desirable that the Gulf of Manaar and Palk's Straits should be connected by the passage recommended by Sir James Elphinstone, and that the Government should be pressed at once to adopt steps to carry out that scheme."

Seconded by Mr. LAURIE, and carried unanimously.

A vote of thanks to Sir James Elphinstone and the Chairman terminated the proceedings.

Ship Canal Between India and Ceylon.

DEPUTATION FROM THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL, K.T., SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

WEDNESDAY, May 3, 1871.

The deputation consisted of the following gentlemen: E. B. Eastwick, Esq., C.B., M.P., Chairman of the Council of the Association; Sir Jas. Elphinstone, Bart., M.P.; General Sir Arthur Cotton, K.C.B.; Major-General C. E. Hill, R.E.; George Noble Taylor, Esq.; Lieut.-General Parr; J. B. Smith, Esq., M.P.; Hugh Birley, Esq., M.P. for Manchester; Colonel P. T. French; Lieut.-Col. W. Nassau Lees; Major Evans Bell; Capt. W. C. Palmer; Messrs. W. S. Fitzwilliam; R. Vicars Boyle, C.S.I.; W. Tayler; George Foggo; W. D. Fox, Andrew Cassels; J. T. Prichard; S. G. Grady; Syed Ameer Ali; Ardaseer Cowasjee; A. Cursetjee; A. C. Brice; Thomas Briggs; Robert Carlyle; K. G. Deshmukh; William Duncan; J. A. Gibbons; Hafiz Ahmed Hassan; Jaafar Hosen; J. J. Gazdar; Edward Knight; J. S. Laurie; Mahomed Hickmatula; M. Mittra; W. Maitland; Mirza Peer Bukhsh; W. T. S. Oakes; James Ouchterlony; J. C. Parry; T. C. Poonen; J. S. Price; Rakhal C. Roy; R. C. Saunders; C. J. Sharpley; D. Sutherland; P. M. Tait; S. B. Thakur; James T. Wood; the Dewan Kazi Shahabudin (Acting Hon. Secretary); and Mr. John T. Zorn, the Assistant Secretary. Mr. Grant Duff entered at the same time with his Grace, and a few gentlemen subsequently during the proceedings, which would also account for their not being mentioned by name.

Mr. EASTWICK introduced the deputation to his Grace, and observed that in doing so it was unnecessary for him to say more than a few words, as there were present Sir James Elphinstone, Sir Arthur Cotton, and other gentlemen who were perfectly and practically acquainted with the subject. He would only remind his Grace that a Committee of the House of Commons sat in 1862 to inquire into the question, and since then Sir James Elphinstone, who was Chairman of that Committee, had personally examined the locality, and had found a better line of communication between the Gulf of Manaar and the Palk's Straits than by the Paumben Passage. Sir James had then introduced the subject in the House of Commons, when there had been a short debate on it, and had subsequently addressed a crowded meeting of the East India Association. At that meeting there were a number of gentlemen present conversant with the question, and it was unanimously resolved

to memorialise his Grace on the subject. He would now call on Mr. Tayler to read the memorial adopted.

Mr. WILLIAM TAYLER then read the following memorial, and on placing it in the hands of the Duke, said that there were so many gentlemen present more competent than himself to enter upon the details of the scheme to which the memorial referred, that he would not trespass on his Grace's time by offering any observations of his own, but would merely wish to say on the part of the Association that they had considered it their duty to afford to the proposition all the aid and support in their power, because, after the decision at their late meeting, the members present had unanimously arrived at the conclusion that the scheme was one which would confer great advantages on the commerce of Great Britain and India—that the engineering difficulty was *nil*, and the expenditure trifling:—

My Lord Duke,—We, the members of the East India Association, have the honour to submit the following memorial to your Grace, in the assured belief that the importance of the subject will secure to it your Grace's careful consideration:—

"On the 28th ult., Sir James Elphinstone made a statement before the East India Association setting forth the details of a plan for cutting a channel through a neck of land projecting from the Continent of India, between the Island of Ceylon and the mainland, a plan which, if carried into execution, would have the effect of shortening the passage between England and Eastern India by 360 miles, and at the same time securing a safe and commodious harbour for large ships and steamers, infinitely preferable to that which is now available at Galle.

"The full details of this scheme are to be found in the accompanying paper, as described by Sir James Elphinstone himself; while the importance and feasibility of the project is attested in the letter which is quoted in that statement from Captain Donnan, the Master Attendant at Colombo.

"Looking to the great advantages to be obtained by the plan now proposed, the absence of all engineering difficulties in its execution, and the comparatively trifling cost which it will entail,

"Your memorialists confidently hope that your Grace will afford your early and favourable consideration to the subject, and adopt such measures as may induce Her Majesty's Government, after such further investigation as may appear expedient, to sanction the work."

(Signed) E. B. EASTWICK,
Chairman of the Council of the East India Association.
KAZI SHAHABUDIN, Acting Hon. Sec.

Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE, Bart., M.P.—My Lord Duke: To add to what I have said before I would remark that we have discovered finished charts at the Admiralty, on the scale of two inches to the mile, also topographical notes of a survey, in the handwriting of Captain Powell and another officer. They give a brief account of the shores of Madura; and it is satisfactory to find that the sandstone rock which runs through

the Tonitori neck and across the pass exists at the point where we wish to cut the canal. The Government of Ceylon have determined, if practicable, to make a harbour at Colombo, if 600,000*l.* or 700,000*l.* will defray the expense, and thus perfect their communication. The coaling at Colombo could be done in fresh water, which is a point of importance. It would also materially affect the steam traffic, as vessels passing through Paumben Pass would still effect a saving of 250 miles by coaling at Colombo and proceeding through the Paumben Canal. And as the Secretary for Colonial Affairs has abandoned the idea of attempting important works at Galle, it becomes absolutely necessary that some smooth-water harbour should exist for the purposes of coaling and as a station for vessels to take their departure. Under these circumstances the very growing trade which must ensue from the passage of the Suez Canal is worthy of your Grace's consideration, and we hope you will urge it upon the Government officer (Engineer Robertson) who is now in India for the very purpose of examining harbours along those coasts, to direct his especial attention to the points we have indicated, and thus the Government of India would be able to judge of the practicability and expense of the work.

Mr. J. B. Smith, M.P.—I was a member of the Committee of the House of Commons on the Paumben Pass, and the Committee unanimously reported in favour of making a ship canal through that pass; but, as Sir James Elphinstone has observed, since that time the Suez Canal has been opened, and the importance of making a canal also through the Paumben Pass is become more urgent and necessary. Now I anticipate your Grace's objection to this project, and that is, a Government grant for the necessary outlay. I have for many years endeavoured to show that all reproductive works of this nature may be made without costing the Government one farthing. I have repeatedly mentioned similar cases to this, where works have been executed in America without any cost to the Government, but I will now refer to a striking case in our own country. Little more than a century and a half ago Liverpool was a mere fishing port; it is now one of the most important ports in this kingdom, and possesses some of the finest docks in the world, and these magnificent docks have been formed without costing the Government or the town of Liverpool one farthing. The whole of the money for their construction was borrowed by the issue of dock bonds, and to pay the interest and principal on these bonds a tonnage duty is levied on all ships entering the docks. And precisely the same course could be pursued in making the necessary canal at Paumben. The money might be borrowed without the slightest difficulty, and the interest and principal may be both paid by levying a

small toll on ships passing through the canal. After that the toll might be reduced, or be made merely nominal. I have long been impressed with the important works the Indian Government might in this way undertake, without costing them anything, and the longer I live the stronger are my convictions on this subject. I may add that I speak the sentiments of the Chamber of Commerce at Manchester on this subject, having had the honour for some years of being its President.

Mr. HUGH BIRLEY, M.P. for Manchester. — I remember when I made the voyage to India some twenty-five years ago, the inconvenience of not having the passage now advocated was even then felt; and the great development of trade and shipping since that time makes the necessity of a passage for large ships through the Paumben Pass still greater. I concur with Mr. Smith in the way it could be done. Take Indian railways as an example. The same principle, adopted in questions of this sort, would produce great advantages to commerce and cause Government no risk, and Government should, I think, afford every possible facility for so important an undertaking.

Sir ARTHUR COTTON.—About fifty years ago the Madras Government sent me down to examine the Paumben Pass. I have been there repeatedly since that time, and I am quite confident that no engineering difficulty whatever exists, and the expense would be almost nominal, as I cannot conceive it costing more than 90,000*l.*

The Duke of ARGYLL.—You have seen the spot which Sir James Elphinstone now recommends for a new ship canal?

Sir ARTHUR COTTON.—I have been there repeatedly. The tonnage, which was 17,000 tons before we enlarged the present pass, has since been increased to 220,000 tons. It was then, according to the petty way in which things were done in those days, impossible to get a large sum of money. We were all of opinion that it should be made a ship canal at first. Small sums of money were received from time to time, and the pass was deepened to twelve feet, by which innumerable lives have been saved. Since then 5,000,000 of tons have passed through. Now that the Suez Canal is opened the whole phase of the case is altered. It was an important question before, but is now fifty times more so. In the course of this investigation it has been ascertained that there is the finest port in India at the site proposed for the canal. With respect to the cost and probable traffic I have not the smallest doubt that the tolls would pay the interest over and over again. The tolls might be really nominal. France having made us a present of a canal which cost £18,000,000, I think it becomes us to accomplish the small undertakings necessary to complete the communication between London and India. It should not be lost sight of that by carrying out Sir

James Elphinstone's plan, a complete communication will be obtained between the capital of the Eastern and that of the Western half of the British Empire. Any sum should be devoted to such an enterprise. If it cost 100,000*l.* the tolls would pay it over and over again. The distance through the land is about a mile and a half; about half a mile on each side requires deepening; therefore vessels would only have two and a half miles of narrow water to go through. It would be superfluous to make it of sufficient width to allow vessels to pass each other, as they would seldom meet, and when they did they would be simply delayed twenty minutes. For coaling it would offer every possible facility, and coals would be supplied from the Chunda coal-field through the port of Coringa at a moderate cost. The land there consists of soft sandstone, dead coral, and sand, which could be very easily cut through. We have done much in experimental work in sandstone, and I feel perfectly satisfied as an engineer that there is not the slightest difficulty in making a complete estimate of the cost.

Mr. William Maitland.—Having been a merchant in Calcutta for many years, and also a director of a Marine Insurance Company, I can speak on the importance of the undertaking to merchants, shipowners, and underwriters, especially now that the Suez Canal is opened. Were this not the case the matter would still deserve attention as an important measure, but its importance is immensely increased now. It is well known that the traffic has already, to a great extent, been diverted from the old to this new route, and that steamers only are used on it. If a steamer has to go 360 miles less in her voyage to India she can do with less coal, and consequently carry a larger freight-bearing cargo, which is exceedingly important. Then, again, time to steamers at present carrying on the trade is another important consideration; as owners are doing all they can to turn their vessels quickly round, and they are now carrying all sorts of goods, even the most bulky ones, the saving of time enabling them to run at low rates of freight.

Mr. Andrew Cassels observed that in the opinion of mercantile men generally steam would soon quite supersede sails in the carrying trade between this country and the East; that sailing ships not having auxiliary screws would gradually disappear from the Eastern seas, save and except, perhaps, as carriers of one article—*coal*. As steamers only could pass through the proposed channel, the point was of importance.

Mr. W. S. Fitzwilliam.—My Lord Duke: The subject now before your Grace has been so ably treated by the gentlemen who have preceded me that it leaves but little for me to add; but as I have for thirty-five years been interested in the trade of India and China practically so for many years as a shipowner connected with America and England, I

can bear testimony to the great importance of the proposed undertaking and I think may venture to say, in the name of the largest shipowners of this country, that they have for many years seen the great importance of such a means of communication being opened for the trade with the East. The saving of time by the use of the proposed canal will be very great, and will therefore, looking at it in a pecuniary sense, be a great national profit. It is not, however, a merely Indian or English question, but one that will interest the whole commercial world—American, German, French, and Italian vessels, and especially those passing through the Suez Canal will gladly take advantage of the proposed canal, the more so as there is little doubt that the trade between the West and the East will for the future be carried on chiefly by steamers. The heavier class of cargoes, such as coals, &c., may still be carried by sailing vessels, but even that is a question for further experience. Looking therefore at the proposal now laid before your Grace, as one of importance to the whole commercial world, I feel assured that all the owners of vessels using the canal would willingly pay a rate of toll that would not only pay a large interest for the money advanced, but also in a few years pay off the whole cost of its construction. Looking upon it as an Imperial question, affecting the commercial interests of both England and India, I will venture to say that I think our own Government should advance the necessary means for its construction; and as for the money required for so doing, either with or without guarantee, I believe it can be raised by myself or others at an hour's notice in this very city of London.

His Grace the Duke of ARGYLL expressed his opinion that if the work could be done for the sum named, or any sum near it, and if the amount of shipping which would take advantage of it were anything near the amount estimated by the gentlemen who had spoken, then the mere matter of expense was hardly worth considering. He must point out, however, that the work was not exclusively an Indian one, but a work which concerned a great part of the commerce of the West with the whole East; and whatever cost or risk might be involved was a cost and risk which ought to be shared by the Colonial and by the Imperial Governments.

Mr. EASTWICK: We thank your Grace, and are confident that the subject could not be in better hands. When it is done every one will wonder why it was not done before.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

1870-71.

THE Annual Meeting of the East India Association was held at 20, Great George-street, London, S.W., on Wednesday, June 21, 1871, at three P.M. The Right Hon. the Lord Lyveden, P.C., President of the Association, occupied the chair. The minutes of the last annual meeting having been formally presented, the Right Hon. Chairman called upon the Acting Honorary Secretary, Dewan Kazi Shahabudin, to present the annual report.

The Acting Hon. Secretary then presented the report, which was as follows:

Your Council now beg to submit their Report for the year 1870-71.

In the last Report your Council congratulated the Association on the success of its exertions for the admission of natives into the Covenanted Civil Service, by the enactment of clause 6 of 33 Vic. cap. 3.

It is now more than a year since this Act was passed, and the promulgation by the Viceroy of the rules required by the said clause has been looked for with intense interest; but your Council regrets to say that the rules are not yet published, and no opinion, therefore, can yet be given as to how far the enactment of the above clause is likely to satisfy the just expectations of the natives of India.

With regard to the Memorial presented by your Council on the subject of delay of justice to Indian appellants, the Association is aware that a Bill was brought last session into Parliament to reconstitute the appellate courts of this country. This Bill was not passed; but your Council has reason to believe that this important subject will soon engage the attention of Parliament; for in reply to the question put by Mr. Watkin Williams on the 10th of March to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he was aware that the accumulation of arrears before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is greatly on the increase, to the serious pecuniary loss of the suitors, and whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose any measure in the present session to remedy this grievance, Mr. Bruce said, that although the arrears had recently rather decreased than increased, as he was informed, it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a Bill this session on the subject.

A third important subject, that of the relation of Native States to the British Government, and the principles of adjudication on matters of dispute arising among themselves, or between any one of them and the Imperial Government, has not been lost sight of, and the Council hopes

that further discussion and practical action thereon may take place hereafter.

In the last Report the Council had expressed a hope that the papers then expected to be read during the session would prove interesting and useful, and it cannot but congratulate the Association on the realisation of this hope to a degree far beyond its expectation. The Council ventures to say that the last session of this Association has been one of great public and practical value.

The following is a list of the papers read, from which the important and useful character of the topics brought forward will be easily seen :—

1870.

May 13.—Miss CARPENTER. On the Work done by her for Female Education in India.

June 8.—Professor THEODOR GOLDSTÜCKER, Ph.D. On the Deficiencies in the present Administration of Hindu Law.

June 15.—I. T. PRICHARD, Esq. On Indian Finance.

June 22.—Sir BARTLE FRERE. On Public Works in India.

June 30.—W. S. FITZWILLIAM, Esq. On the Present and Future Product of Cotton in India compared with that of America and other Cotton Producing Countries.

July 6.—Sir BARTLE FRERE. Adjourned Discussion. On Public Works in India.

July 13.—Major EVANS BELL. Is India a Conquered Country? And if so, what then?

July 27.—Sir CHARLES TREVELYAN. On the Finances of India.

July 27.—DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq. The Wants and Means of India.

July 27.—RESOLUTION to Memorialise Parliament for Select Committees to Inquire into the Whole Administration of India.

1871.

The PETITION to the House of Commons (in accordance with the above Resolution) was presented on Friday, 17th Feb., by Sir Charles J. Wingfield, K.C.S.I., C.B , M.P.

March 7.—Sir CHARLES TREVELYAN. Adjourned Discussion. On the Finances of India.

March 28.—Sir JAMES ELPHINSTONE, Bart., M.P. On the Proposed Plan to Cut a Channel for Ships between India and Ceylon.

To all the readers of the papers, and the gentlemen who took an active part in the discussions, the Council tender their best thanks.

Dr. Goldstücker's paper on Hindu Law, the Council has reason to think, will lead to some practical steps being taken in the official department that is responsible for this branch of administration.

The chief question of our last session was Indian Finance. The weight and authority of the opinions of the readers of various papers,

especially of Mr. I. T. Prichard in the first instance, and subsequently of Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Charles Trevelyan, attracted much attention to the subject, and at once led to action on the part of this Association, with marked and manifest effect. The Council, in accordance with the Resolution proposed by Mr. W. Tayler, and passed at its meeting of 27th July last, under the presidency of Sir Charles Trevelyan, presented a petition to the House of Commons by one of its own body, Sir Charles Wingfield, Member for Gravesend, for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the financial and general administration of India.

The Committee, on the motion of Mr. H. Fawcett, and subsequently on that of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, has been appointed and is already at work; and although, to the great regret of the Council, the inquiries have been restricted to the question of finance, it is hoped that the labours of this Select Committee will greatly benefit India, by creating, both in Parliament and in the public mind, an interest in the settlement and adoption of sound principles of administration, by which the prosperity, elevation, and enlightenment of India may be promoted in a manner worthy of its British rulers. The Council takes this opportunity of thanking all those Members of Parliament who aided in obtaining the appointment of the Select Committee.

Mr. C. E. Spooner had offered to read a very able paper on the adoption of a narrow gauge for future railways in India, and the Council had accepted the offer. Subsequently however, the Council becoming aware that the Indian Government had adopted the narrow gauge, decided, with the concurrence of Mr. Spooner himself, that there was no necessity to read his paper, for which the thanks of the Association were given, and it was therefore withdrawn.

In order to extend the effect of our labours as widely as possible, the Hon. Sec. read a paper at a meeting of the Society of Arts, on "The Commerce of India." The Society of Arts, therefore, it will be seen from this, as well as from the frequent permission to use its rooms for the meetings of this Association, gives the great advantage of its cordial co-operation, and the Council records with pleasure its deep sense of obligation to that distinguished and influential Society. The Association is also aware that the Society of Arts, in addition to the kind assistance thus given, holds its own Indian Conferences, and thus further promotes the main objects of this Association.

The Council has arranged with Messrs. Hansard to print separately in a pamphlet form all the Indian debates in Parliament. The number for the latter half-session of the last year is ready and is for sale at the offices of the Association, at 2s. a copy. The Council intends to continue this publication if a sufficient number of subscribers be obtained.

It is very gratifying to the Council to find that the objects of this Association—viz., to aid in the proper administration of the affairs of India by respectfully submitting to the Indian authorities from time to time matters and views tending to that effect—are, it has reason to believe, understood and appreciated by the authorities. Your Council continues to receive much information from the India Office, by the present of Parliamentary Returns, Selections from Government Records, and other publications of the Home or Indian Governments, many of which would not be otherwise obtainable.

Your Council has also received a large and liberal present of works on India, which could be spared from the India Office Library. For all this the Council tenders its best thanks to his Grace the Duke of Argyll and Mr. Grant Duff. The application of the Council to the different Indian Governments to furnish this Association and its Bombay Branch with such publications as the India Office cannot spare from their Records has been promptly responded to by the Governments of India, Bengal, Madras, and the Punjaub, and the Council tenders its best thanks for the same. Replies from the other Governments and Administrations have not yet been received.

Presents of books have continued, and the Council has, on every occasion, offered its thanks to the donors. A complete list of the books in the library of the Association is now in course of preparation, in which the names of the donors will be given. The Council is glad to inform the Association that the Proprietors of the following Indian newspapers, both Native and English, present a copy for the use of the Reading-room of this Association:—

The Delhi Gazette	Agra.
„ *Aligurh Gazette*	Aligurh.
„ *Mofussilite*	Allahabad.
„ *Hindu Reformer*	Bombay.
„ *Indu Prakash*	„
„ *Native Opinion*	„
„ *Times of India*	„
„ *Bengalee*	Calcutta.
„ *Friend of India*	„
„ *Hindoo Patriot*	„
„ *Indian Daily News*	„
„ *Indian Economist*	„
„ *Indian Mirror*	„
„ *Jabulpur Chronicle*	Jabulpur.
„ *Madras Athenæum and Daily News*	Madras.
„ *Madras Times*	„
„ *Indian Public Opinion*	Lahore.
„ *Kohi-noor*	„

To the Proprietors of the above papers the Council tenders its best thanks.

Your Council thinks it proper to bring to the notice of the Association certain incidents which do not come under detailed record. It has frequently happened that the Council has desired to take action in regard to sundry matters on which information was desirable. In these cases, instead of entering upon formal and official correspondence, several Members of your Council, more especially Sir Charles Wingfield and Mr. Eastwick, have made the necessary inquiries personally, and thus enabled the Council to dispose of the question without delay or difficulty.

The Hon. Secretary particularly requests the Council to allow him the opportunity of recording his obligations to Mr. Grant Duff and the Secretaries and Heads of the different departments of the India Office, for always promptly and courteously furnishing him with any information he needed that could possibly be given. This help enabled the Hon. Sec. to avoid much unnecessary formal correspondence, and to study several important matters which, otherwise, it would have been out of his power to do.

Since the last meeting sixty-six new Members have been elected.

The Association will remember that at the time of the death of the late Secretary, the accounts being left in great confusion, the Hon. Secretary had offered to go through all documents and books, and put them in order. As much of his time, however, was taken up by the current work of the Association, the Council gave him the assistance of Mr. J. T. Zorn, who, with great zeal and ability, as a professional accountant, has examined the accounts thoroughly, and prepared complete books from the very commencement of the Association. An abstract of such accounts from the commencement of the Association is appended for the information of Members.

The Council has requested and authorised the Hon. Sec., who has just gone to India, to inquire why the remittances made during the last eighteen months have been so limited. The Council further expresses its hope that this Association, as an institution in this country and as a living symbol of British sympathy with the welfare of India, will be largely supported by the English public generally, its objects being no other than to aid in promoting the contentment and enlightenment of our 200,000,000 of fellow subjects, and thus, by securing their loyalty and attachment to the British rule, to increase the strength and prosperity of the British Empire. The Council makes a special appeal to Englishmen who have had or have connections with India, by commerce, service, or in independent professions, to lend their aid in the work of this Association for promoting the elevation and happiness of the people of India. The Council, therefore, hopes that every Member of the

Association will exert his influence to interest and induce his friends to support it.

The Council has had communications during the year with the British Indian Association, the Bombay Association, the Chuprah Association, the Madras Petition Committee, and the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha.

The following Members of Council retire by rotation. The Council recommends their re-election: Lord Walter Henry Erskine, Lord W. M. Hay, Colonel W. H. Sykes, M.P., Lieut.-Colonel Jervis, M.P., Sir Frederick M. Williams, Bart., M.P., E. B. Eastwick, Esq., C.B., M.P.

The following Members of Council were elected in the room of others who had resigned and left England. The Council recommends confirmation of their election:—

Members Elected.

C. P. Lutchmeepathy Naidoo Garoo, in place of—
Syed Ahmed Khan, Esq., returned to India.

William Fowler, Esq., M.P., ditto—
D. D. Cama, Esq., returned to India.

R. N. Fowler, Esq., M.P., ditto—
Major-General C. F. North, resigned.

Standish G. Grady, Esq., ditto—
H. A. Wadya, Esq., returned to India.

C. B. Denison, Esq., M.P., ditto—
The Earl of Kellie, resigned.

The Report of the Bombay Branch of your Association is appended.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji having intimated his intention of visiting Bombay for the purpose of communicating with the subscribers at that Presidency, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—

"The Council of the East India Association, hearing from Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji that he purposes proceeding to India, resolves to take this opportunity of tendering to him its warm acknowledgment for his assiduous attention to the interests of the Association. It accepts with thanks his kind offer to advocate the claims of the Association in Bombay, and trusts his exertions on behalf of the Association will meet with success. It hereby requests and authorises him to take such steps to attain that end as he may deem expedient, not only in Bombay, but also in such other parts of India as he may visit.

"Resolved, that the offer of Dewan Kazi Shahabudin to act as Hon. Secretary during Mr. Dadabhai's absence be accepted with thanks."

The Right Hon. the CHAIRMAN observed that the Council might advantageously turn their attention to economy in expenditure, and the printing account appeared fit matter for inquiry. The Council had had

a series of highly interesting lectures, but he would warn them not indiscriminately to print every one of them; and others might be obtained in a much cheaper form. Take, for instance, the lecture on a very abstruse subject, by Dr. Goldstücker. It was printed at the Association's expense, and issued to the members; yet the next day after the issue of the Journal he (the speaker) received the same lecture in a pamphlet form published by Dr. Goldstücker himself.

Dr. THEODOR GOLDSTUCKER explained that after the Association's copies had been printed, he had some extra copies struck off for distribution among non-members of the Association, at his own expense.

The Right Hon. CHAIRMAN remarked that this only showed that extra expense was incurred by somebody, either the Association or Dr. Goldstücker; and there was little doubt that in other respects the printing expenses might be largely diminished. He repeated that as there were no probable means of increasing the revenue of the Association, the Council must turn their attention to decreasing the expenditure wherever it was practicable.

Mr. FITZWILLIAM said the printing expenses had been reduced fully twenty-five per cent. In respect to the printing of the papers which were read before the Association they could hardly further curtail the expenses; and some of them were of great value and importance, as, for instance, the paper recently given by Sir Bartle Frere.

Colonel SYKES agreed in thinking the printing expenses somewhat heavy. There was no other society or association in London which did not refer to a committee any paper which was proposed to be read, and the examining committee decided whether it was a suitable subject, and fixed a day for its reading, But if the papers were not subject to a selection of this kind there was no knowing what the expenses would be. All papers offered to be read should be reported on by a committee.

Mr. FITZWILLIAM said he thought the papers read before the Association were always examined previously by the Council; and even though the expense was very great, the exceptional merit of most of the papers amply justified the cost. He then moved the adoption of the report.

Mr. GIBBONS seconded the motion, which was agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. FITZWILLIAM proposed that the Right Hon. the Lord Lyveden, P.C., be re-elected President for the ensuing year; and in doing so he remarked that he thought it was hardly necessary to say how greatly they were indebted to the Noble Chairman for the assistance he gave in establishing the Association, and for what he has done in supporting it. In spite of their difficulties, there was no association in London which held a higher rank than the East India Association, a result mainly due to Lord Lyveden and the other members of the Council, who had greatly interested themselves in the Association's welfare.

DEWAN KAZI SHAHABUDIN seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The noble CHAIRMAN, in acknowledging the vote, said he thanked them for the honour they conferred upon him. He was perfectly ready to go on as President, if he could be of any use; although he confessed he was ashamed to think of how little use he was. The numerous calls upon his time, however, prevented him from doing more. In conclusion, he expressed his best wishes for the prosperity and success of the Association.

Captain PALMER proposed that the following noblemen and gentlemen be elected Vice-Presidents for the ensuing year:

The Most Noble the Marquis of SALISBURY, P.C., M.A., F.R.S., M.R.A.S.
The Right Hon. the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, K.G., F.R.A.S., F.S.S., &c.
The Right Hon. the Earl of ELLENBOROUGH, G.C.B., P.C., F.R.G.S., &c.
The Right Hon. Lord HARRIS, G.C.S.I.
General Lord STRATHNAIRN, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., Member of H.M.'s Most Honourable Privy Council of Ireland.
General Right Hon. Lord SANDHURST, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., P.C.
Lord WM. MONTAGU HAY, F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S.
Sir JAMES FERGUSON, Bart., Governor of South Australia, P.C.
Sir CHARLES EDWARD TREVELYAN, K.C.B., F.R.G.S., &c.
Right Hon. JAMES STANSFELD, P.C., M.P.
Colonel WILLIAM HENRY SYKES, M.P., F.R.S., V.P.S.S., &c.
His Highness the Rao of KUTCH, G.C.S.I.
His Highness the Nawab of JOONAGHUR, K.C.S.I.

In proposing this list Captain Palmer remarked that he need only mention the names to show what interest was taken in the Association.

Mr. PRICE seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed to.

Dr. THEODOR GOLDSTUCKER moved that the following noblemen and gentlemen be elected to form a Council for the ensuing year:

Chairman—E. B. EASTWICK, Esq., C.B., M.P., F.R.S., F.S.A., M.R.A.S.
Vice-Chairman—Sir CHARLES JOHN WINGFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B., M.P.,&c.
Lord WALTER HENRY ERSKINE.
Lord WM. MONTAGU HAY, F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S.
Sir F. M. WILLIAMS, Bart., M.P., F.G.S., F.A.S.L., &c.
Field-Marshal Sir GEORGE POLLOCK, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S., &c.
Major-General Sir HENRY C. RAWLINSON, K.C.S.I., K.C.B., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., V.P.R.G.S., V.P.R.S.L., Ord. Boruss. "Pour le Merite" Eq., &c.
Major-General Sir VINCENT EYRE, K.C.S.I., C.B., R.A., F.R.G.S.
Major-General Sir R. WALLACE, K.C.S.I.

Major-General Edw. Wm. S. Scott, R.A.
Colonel W. H. Sykes, M.P., Hon. M.R.I.A., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., V.P.S.S., F.G.S., F.R.G.S.
Lieut.-Colonel H. J. W. Jervis, M.P.
William Fowler, Esq., M.P., F.S.S.
R. N. Fowler, Esq., M.P., M.A., F.R.G.S.
Christopher Beckett Denison, Esq., M.P.
Standish Grove Grady, Esq., Recorder of Gravesend, Reader on Hindu Law, &c.
Colonel Pat. Theo. French.
Major Thomas Evans Bell, M.R.A.S.
Captain William Charles Palmer.
Professor Theodor Goldstucker, Ph.D.
W. S. Fitzwilliam, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.S.S.
I. T. Prichard, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., &c.
P. M. Tait, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.S.S.
Stephen P. Low, Esq., F.R.G.S.
William Tayler, Esq., Retired B.C.S.
Patrick Pirie Gordon, Esq.
Khan Bahadoor Kazi Shahabudin, Dewan of H.H. the Rao of Kutch.
Moulvi Syed Ameer Ali, M.A., LL.B.
Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., Hon. Sec.
Jamsetji Jivanji Gazdar, Esq., M.A.
Baboo Kishori Mohun Chatterjee, LL.B., B.A.
C. P. Lutchmeepathy Naidoo Garoo, F.S.S., M.R.A.S.

Syed Ameer Ali, in seconding the motion, said he was sure all who were present would heartily agree to the election of the names read by Dr. Goldstücker.

The motion was then agreed to *nem con.*

Gen. Sir G. Le G. Jacob proposed that the thanks of the Association be given to the President, Vice-Presidents, and Members of the Council for the past year. He said he thought they all ought to be, and were, most deeply indebted to those gentlemen who took this trouble merely for the sake of the interest which they felt in the distant country in whose behalf the Association was established. These gentlemen who thus gave their time and their services could have no personal object to serve in meeting together to listen to anything that might be of benefit to the people of India; and those who devoted however small a portion of their time to such a work were deserving of the deep gratitude of the people of India and of those who, like himself, were retired from it, and, although looking soon to leave the world altogether, still felt an interest in the country they had left. In conclusion, he trusted the Council would continue to exhibit the strong interest they had manifested in the

past in all that would promote the welfare, or was associated with the well-being of the people of India. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. I. T. PRICHARD seconded the resolution, remarking that although his position as a Member of the Council made his doing so appear rather invidious, yet he could bear personal testimony to the fact that his colleagues had done their best to fulfil the duties entrusted to them.

The resolution was then adopted.

Sir HENRY RICKETTS proposed "a vote of thanks to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Hon. Sec. of the Association, for his untiring zeal and devotedness to the interests of the Association," and, in doing so, he observed that, from what had already passed, it was certain that the Association were under great obligations to Mr. Dadabhai, for he not only undertook and performed the duties of the Honorary Secretary without any remuneration, but it was quite clear that if it had not been for his timely advance of funds, the Association would have been placed in a very anomalous position.

Mr. LEWIS seconded the motion, which was agreed to unanimously.

Colonel SYKES said the occasion ought not to be allowed to pass without an acknowledgment on the part of the Association of the very valuable services of the present Acting Honorary Secretary, Dewan Kazi Shahabudin, who had done the work since Mr. Dadabhai had gone away. (Hear, hear.)

Gen. Sir G. Le G. JACOB said he could cordially second that motion. He had known Dewan Kazi Shahabudin for twenty years, and had always the highest opinion of him; and the Association were fortunate in securing his services. He deserved the sincere thanks of the Association for the labour he had undertaken.

The resolution having been carried,

DEWAN KAZI SHAHABUDIN, after briefly acknowledging the compliment, said what had been said about him was very encouraging to him. He did not feel that he was making any great sacrifice in giving his time to the advancement of the interests of the Association.

Mr. FITZWILLIAM proposed a vote of thanks to the noble Chairman for the manner in which he had conducted the business of the meeting.

Colonel SYKES seconded the motion, and observed that he had great pleasure in bearing testimony to the interest which Lord Lyveden had always exhibited in Indian affairs for forty years or more.

The resolution having been agreed to *nem. con.*,

Lord LYVEDEN acknowledged the vote by observing that he only wished his services to the Association were equal to the gratitude expressed by the members.

The proceedings then terminated.

GENERAL ABSTRACT OF THE ACCOUNTS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,

From its Commencement in November, 1866, to the 30th April, 1871.

Dr.						
To Amount received from Members and Donors, viz. :—						
Donors	£1,212	16	0			
Life Members	1,580	0	0			
Annual Members	1,653	15	0			
Subscription to Journal	406	10	8			
				£4,853	1	8
Interest Account				34	6	5
Madras Agency				4	18	6
Dadabhai Naoroji				528	16	6
				£5,421	3	1

Cr.						
By Expenses, viz. :—						
Miscellaneous Printing	£227	3	2			
Indian Charges	352	11	10			
Rent	711	4	4			
Newspapers, Advertising, & Stationery	345	16	4			
Reporting	255	7	7			
Postages and Freights	309	5	10			
Salaries and Office Expenses	1,179	0	2			
				£3,380	9	3
By Furniture and Fixtures, "London"	130	0	0			
do. do. "Bombay"	15	0	0			
By Library	30	0	0			
				£175	0	0
By Indian Debates				35	8	6
Journal Account				802	11	6
T. A. Johnson				28	11	5
Profit and Loss Account, including Loss on Exchange				221	15	6
Government Notes				431	8	3
Cash at Bankers, viz.:						
Messrs. Grindlay & Co., general account	£307	2	5			
Do. do. Library Fund	7	4	0			
London and Westminster Bank	30	12	3			
Uncovenanted Service Bank, Bareilly	1	0	0			
				£345	18	8
				£5,421	3	1

Examined with ledger and vouchers and found correct.

30th May, 1871.

J. C. PARRY,
J. J. GAZDAR, } Auditors.

KAZI SHAHABUDIN,
Acting Hon. Secretary, East India Association.

RULES.

I.—Objects of the Association.

Article 1. The East India Association is instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

II.—Members.

Article 2. The Association shall consist of Resident and Non-Resident Ordinary and Honorary Members.

Article 3. Honorary Members shall have the same rights and privileges as Ordinary Members.

Article 4. Honorary Members shall be nominated by the Council at any Ordinary Meeting, and shall consist of persons who have distinguished themselves in promoting the good of India.

Article 5. Ordinary Members shall be nominated in writing by two Members of the Association, and elected after ten days' notice of such nomination, at the next General Meeting of the Council, if approved by a majority of two-thirds present thereat.

Article 6. The Election of every Member, both Ordinary and Honorary, shall be recorded on the minutes of the Council; and the Secretary shall forthwith notify, by letter, his election to the Member, and request such Member to furnish a standing order on his Banker for his Annual Subscription.

Article 7. Ordinary Members shall pay an Annual Subscription of 1*l.*, or 10 Rs., on the 1st January in every year; or may compound for the same by payment of 100 Rs., or 10*l.*, which shall constitute a Life Member.

Note—Total Annual Subscription, including Journal (delivered free of postage)	£1	5	0
Life Subscription ditto ditto	14	0	0
Annual Subscription (including Journal), in India.....	13 Rupees	8 Annas.	
Life Subscription ditto ditto.....	150 ,,		

III.—Mode of Management.

Article 8. The Management of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Thirty Ordinary Members; Five to form a Quorum; and Eight to retire annually by Rotation, but eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

Article 9. A President of the Association shall be appointed at the Annual Meeting; and the Council may, from time to time, nominate distinguished Indian Statesmen, or others, as Vice-Presidents, subject to the confirmation of the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 10. The Council shall appoint a Secretary, and such other Employés as may be necessary, and fix their Salaries and Emoluments.

Article 11. The Council may fill up Vacancies in their own body, until the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 12. The Council shall meet on the First Wednesday in the

month; but the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, or any three Members of the Council may at any time convene a Meeting by giving three days' notice.

Article 13. The Council may appoint Special Sub-Committees of not less than Five Members of the Association, three of whom shall form a Quorum.

Article 14. At the desire of Five Members of the Council, or on the written requisition of Ten Members of the Association, the Secretary shall convene a Special Meeting of the Association.

FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICERS.

Article 15. The President, or, in his absence, any Vice-President, or in the absence thereof, any Member, shall preside at the Annual or Ordinary Meetings of the Association.

Article 16. The Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council, or, in their absence, any Member thereof nominated by those present, shall preside at the Meetings of the Council.

ANNUAL MEETING.

Article 17. The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of May in every year.

Article 18. General Ordinary Meetings of the Association for promoting the interests thereof, and for the discussion of subjects connected with India, shall be held at such times and places as the Council may appoint.

Article 19. A statement of the Accounts of the Association shall be prepared, audited by one of the Members of the Council and one Member taken from the general body of the Members of the Society, and circulated with the Report of the Council to each Resident Member ten days before the Annual Meeting.

LOCAL COMMITTEES.

Article 20. Local Committees shall be appointed in India by Local Subscribers, subject to the approval of the Council; and the co-operation of independent Local Associations in India is invited by the "East India Association."

BYE-LAWS.

Article 21. The Council shall have power to make and alter any Bye-laws for the Management of the Association.

ALTERATION OF RULES.

Article 22. No addition to or alteration in these Rules shall be made, except at the Annual Meeting of the Association, previous notice being given in the Circular convening the Meeting.

JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Article 23. The Council may, in their discretion, publish quarterly or otherwise, a Journal, containing a Report of the several General and other Meetings of the Association. Papers submitted for discussion shall be published *in extenso*, or not, as the Council may decide.

JOURNAL

OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Financial Administration of India.

[Addressed to the Select Committee on East India Finance by the Hon. Secretary of the East India Association, Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.]

A CONSIDERABLE number of the best informed and most influential Native and English inhabitants of India, together with others of Her Majesty's subjects of all ranks who have the welfare of that portion of the British Empire at heart, asked for Parliamentary inquiry. Parliament readily granted a Select Committee of the House of Commons, though for an inquiry which was to be limited to Financial Administration. It is, I think, due to Parliament and to the Select Committee that those who prayed for inquiry should say in time what they want, for it would be both unreasonable and useless for them to complain afterwards that the Select Committee did not do this or that. As a native of India, and one who joined in a petition from the East India Association, I most respectfully submit for the consideration of the Select Committee a few remarks as to what I hope and desire from it.

The Financial Administration of any country, like all other human institutions, requires four important elements:—

1st. Materials.

2nd. Head to design.

3rd. Hand to execute.

4th. Sound principles of design and execution. Upon the degree of perfection of each and all of these requisites depends the measure of success.

I.—MATERIALS.

This is the *most important* and fundamental question for decision. Without sufficient and suitable materials to work with, all the other requisites are of no avail whatsoever.

The question, then, is: Does India, even at the present day, produce enough to supply, without hardship or privation, both its ordinary wants as a nation, and its extraordinary and peculiar want to remit to a foreign distant country a portion of its produce as the natural economical result of a foreign rule? I say that India does not produce enough even for the ordinary necessary wants of its children, much less for all their social and peculiar political wants. Is this a fact or not? The Indian Govern-

ment is bound to answer this question definitely. If the India Office should prove me to be wrong, no one will rejoice more than myself. If I be right, then, no ingenious device of even ten Wilsons or Temples will relieve the Financial Administration of its difficulties, unless the Indian legislators and financiers possesss the Divine power of creating something out of nothing. The poverty and privations of the country once admitted, the question then will be, how to remedy this fundamental evil. The subject of the remedies ultimately resolves itself into the following:—

1st. Provision of capital necessary for all public works of a permanent character, both ordinary and extraordinary, which are required to increase production and facilitate distribution, to be provided, if India is impoverished, and has it not.

2nd. A just adjustment of the financial relations between India and England, so that the political drain may be reasonably diminished.*

3rd. The best way of attracting capital and enterprise to utilise the vast culturable waste lands.

4th. The best way of increasing the intelligence of the people by a comprehensive plan of national education, both high and popular.

If the fact of the poor production of India can be proved directly, any indirect test may not be considered necessary; but as questions have been already put in the Committee about such tests, and as these tests are frequently appealed to as proving the prosperity of the country, I think it

* I give this chief cause of the impoverishment of a country in the words of Sir R. Temple himself, written under the direction of Lord Lawrence. (Punjaub Administration Report for 1856-8, Parliamentary Return 212 of 1859, page 16) :—

"In former reports it was explained how the circumstance of so much money going out of the Punjaub contributed to depress the [illegible]. The native regular army was Hindostanee; to them was a large share [illegible] revenues disbursed, of which a part only they spent on the spot, and a part was remitted to their homes. Thus it was that, year after year, lakhs and lakhs were drained from the Punjaub, and enriched Oudh. But within the last year, the native army being Punjabee, all such sums have been paid to them, and have been spent at home. Again, many thousands of Punjabee soldiers are serving abroad. These men not only remit their savings, but also have sent quantities of prize property and plunder, the spoils of Hindoostan, to their native villages. The effect of all this is already perceptible in an increase of agricultural capital, a freer circulation of money, and a fresh impetus to cultivation."

"The Report has been prepared under the direction of Sir John Lawrence, K.C.B., Chief Commissioner of Punjaub, by

"R. TEMPLE,
Secretary to Chief Commissioner, Punjaub."

May I appeal to Sir R. Temple to ponder over this extract, and in his new place of a financier of India, look this same evil for all India boldly in the face, and firmly suggest its proper remedies; so that the burden of the millions and millions that are "year after year drained" from India to England may be reasonably lightened, and the ability of the people to meet the legitimate portion of the drain increased to the necessary extent? Is it also too much for India to expect, or even to claim from Lord Lawrence to represent this evil to the Select Committee and to Parliament, and to obtain for India full redress?

necessary to say a few words regarding them. The tests I refer to more particularly are "rise" in prices and wages, and imports of bullion. I hope mere general assertions on these points will not be considered sufficient. To understand correctly the phenomena of prices and wages, it is absolutely necessary for the India Office to prepare a return of the prices and wages of all districts from, say, twenty years prior to the British acquisition, to the present day, giving also opposite to the figures for each year the causes of the rise or fall, as the case may be. Such a return alone will show the effect of "the drain," after the British acquisition, either as to how far any rise, on the one hand, was the result of scarcity of production, or of increase of prosperity, or of local expenditure on public works; or, on the other, how far any fall was the result of abundance of produce or the poverty of the district; and, further, whether the rise or fall was general or local, permanent or temporary. The average of a collection of districts of the whole country must also be taken correctly, and not in the erroneous manner in which they are at present made up in the Administration Reports.

To show the necessity of what I ask in the above paragraph, I give a few instances. In the Madras selection from Government Records, No. XXXI., of 1856, prices are given of certain periods for several districts. I take those of Chingleput (page 23), for the years 1841-50 (Fuslee, 1251-60), during which the prices suddenly rose from Rs.82 per Garce of Paddy in 1254, to Rs.126 in the next year 1255, and to Rs.124 in 1256, and again went down to Rs.96 and 69 in the succeeding years. So at Rajahmundry, in the prices for the years 1236 to 1245 (1826 to 1834), there is a sudden rise from Rs.64 in 1241 to Rs.111 in 1242, and to Rs.168 in 1243, going down again to Rs.95 and 63 in the succeeding two years. Now, are these high prices in the two couples of years the result of scarcity or prosperity? If the former, how very wrong it would be to take the high averages of these ten years for comparison or as an indication of prosperity? The last two years in the Punjaub have been bad seasons, and the price of wheat has risen from 1st January, '68, to 1st January, '70, at Delhi, from 26 seers (of 2lbs.) per Rs.1 to 9 seers; at Ambala from 24 seers to 9 seers; at Lahore, from 18 seers to 9½. (Punjaub Adm. Report for 1869-70, p. 95.)

Now, is it right from high averages occasioned in this manner to infer prosperity? An hon. Member recently quoted in Parliament the high price of rice at Jubbulpore. Had his informant been a little more communicative, he would have learnt that, while at Jubbulpore, say in the average good season of 1867-8, the price was Rs.3¾ per maund, in the adjoining division of Chutteesghur, the price at Raipore and Belaspore was only Rs.1 per maund, or nearly one-fourth; and that

therefore Jubbulpore, with its local expenditure on public works, was no criterion for the rest of the country. In the North-west Provinces, the price of wheat was about the same in the years 1860 and 1868. But during that interval the province passed through a great famine, and had famine prices. Now, will the average taken with these famine prices be a proper criterion for inferences of prosperity? With regard to the erroneous mode of taking averages of a number of districts, by adding up the prices and dividing the total by the number of the districts, without reference to the quantity produced in each district, I need simply refer to the average taken in the Report of the Central Provinces for 1867-68. It is there made out for rice to be Rs.2¾ per maund, when the actual average was only about Rs.1½.

These few instances will, I hope, suffice to show how carefully the test of prices, and similarly that of wages, have to be ascertained and applied. With reference to wages, two important elements must be borne in mind—the number of the labourers who earn each rate of wages, and the number of days such wages are earned during the year.

So far as my inquiries go at present, the conclusion I draw is, that wherever the East India Company acquired territory impoverishment followed their steps, and it is only from the time that loans for irrigation and railways and other public works, and the windfall of the benefits from the American War returned back, as it were, some of the lost blood, that India has a little revived. But it will require vigorous and steady efforts to increase the production of the country, and diminish its drain to England, before it will be restored to anything like ordinary good health, and be freed from famines.

With regard to imports of bullion, there are sufficient returns for the past seventy years; but they require to be carefully examined to draw any correct inferences from them, taking into consideration the non-production of bullion in the country, the revenue being required to be paid in money, and thereby making silver a necessity in all ordinary transactions of life, the *vast* population among whom these imports are distributed, and the amount of treasure the East India Company and their servants carried away during the last century in the shape of salaries, bribes, booty, &c. Cannot the India Office make some return on this point, to show the exhaustion of the country thus caused which required to be replenished by subsequent imports? It is no use simply depending upon the re-echoing of the general exclamation, "What an enormous quantity of silver has gone to India!" I entreat most earnestly that the first element—viz., the material condition of India—may be most carefully sifted, and the necessary remedies be applied. If this question be not boldly and fairly grappled with it will be, in my humble opinion, the principal rock on which British

rule will wreck. It is impossible for any nation to go on being impoverished without its ultimate destruction, or the removal of the cause.

II. Head to Design.

The head which designs the Imperial financial legislation is the Supreme Legislative Council, while local legislation is designed by the local Councils. All these Councils have a controlling head in the India Office Council in London. The questions, then, to be decided, in order that the designing head may be as efficient and adapted to the end as possible, resolve themselves into these :—

1st. Can any legislation ever do its work satisfactorily in which the opinions, feelings, and thoughts of the people paying the taxes are not fairly represented? Englishmen, no matter how able, and with whatever good intentions, cannot feel as the natives feel, and think as the natives think. The co-operation of a sufficient number of intelligent natives in all the Councils is an absolute necessity to any satisfactory financial legislation. As to any fear of political mischief from taking natives more largely into confidence, I think it to be entirely groundless. But, even granting that there was any risk, I need simply refer to the Act of 1861, in which ample checks and securities are provided. With a sufficiently large number of natives, with a corresponding increase in the number of non-official English members, there will not only be no risk, but, on the contrary, every cause for satisfaction. I may just point out the checks I allude to—

"Provided always, that it shall not be lawful for any Member or Additional Member to introduce, without the previous sanction of the Governor-General, any measure affecting—

"1. The public debt or public revenues of India; or by which any charge would be imposed on such revenues.*

"2. The religion or religious rites and usages of any class of Her Majesty's subjects in India;

"3. The discipline or maintenance of any part of Her Majesty's Military or Naval Forces;

"4. The relation of the Government with Foreign Princes or States." (Clause 19.)

Moreover, the Governor-General has his power of veto; and the

* Though the Indian Councils are thus prohibited from imposing charges on Indian revenues without direct legislation, and the sanction of the Governor-General first obtained to introduce the measure, the Indian Council in England is, in a very anomalous way, left to do what it likes with the revenues of India; take, for instance, the way in which certain charges connected with the Cooper-hill Civil Engineering College are put upon Indian revenues, or the large sum of money spent upon the India Office, or any other charges that the Indian Council chooses to make.

ultimate consent of Her Majesty's Indian Secretary is also necessary. (Clauses 20 and 21.)

Clause 22 limits even the power of the Governor-General as to what he shall not legislate upon, and Clause 43 repeats, with certain additions, as to what the local Council cannot legislate upon except with the sanction of the Governor-General. With such checks there can be nothing to fear.

2nd. Whether decentralization, such as Sir Charles Trevelyan and Sir C. Wingfield, and others who agree with them, propose, is necessary or not to solve difficulties like the following. Some provinces complain that they are taxed more to make up the deficits of others. For instance—supposing that the Zemindars of Bengal are right in claiming exemption from any additional burden on lands, under the Regulation of 1793, would not the scheme of decentralization enable the Bengal Government to provide in some other appropriate way for its own wants, instead of the Supreme Council being obliged to impose the same taxes upon the other parts of India also, as it cannot tax Bengal by itself.

The distant Presidencies complain that the Supreme Council is not able to understand fully their peculiar requirements. With the Governor-General having a veto upon all the legislation of the subordinate Governments, could not the Supreme Government be better able to attend to all Imperial questions without any loss of dignity or power, and yet leave fairly upon the heads of the different Presidencies their fair share of responsibility? These and similar questions with regard to the constitution and work of the Councils in India have to be decided.

Similar questions have also to be considered with regard to the Indian Council in England. First, need there be such a large Council? Secondly, need the Council have the work of supervision of everything that is done in India; or will it act merely as an appellant power, to interfere when appealed to? Is the constitution such as could satisfactorily perform its work with the due knowledge and appreciation of the continuous change of conditions going on in India? And is it not necessary, moreover, that, as in the Councils in India, some suitable representation of native views and interests should exist in the India Office? Lastly, is it right that this Council should have the power to spend the revenues of India as it likes, without some such open legislation, discussion, and check, as is provided for the Councils in India? From this, I hope it will be sufficiently apparent that the element of "the head which designs and controls" the financial administration of India requires careful consideration. The necessity of a fair expression of the views and feelings of the natives has another aspect—viz., that with such co-operation Government will be very largely relieved of the odium of any dissatisfaction among the natives.

All the remarks with reference to the necessity of a fair representation

of natives in the Legislative Councils apply equally to all taxation and expenditure of local funds. For, besides the Imperial revenue of some 50,000,000*l.*, there are local funds raised as follows:—

LOCAL FUNDS.

Gross Receipts for 1867-8, *according to Part I. of Finance and Revenue Accounts of India, published by the Government of India, Calcutta,* 1870, *Account No.* 34, *Pages* 116, 118, 120, *and* 122.

Government of India	£41,028
Oude	194,728
Central Provinces	173,410
British Burmah	105,550
Bengal	623,722
N.W. Provinces	825,007
Punjaub	326,870
Madras	459,199
Bombay	1,093,133
Berars (11 Months of 1866-67, £130,148)	Not given.
Total	£3,842,647

III.—HAND TO EXECUTE.

This hand is formed by all the different services in the Administration. The questions are—

1st. Can these services be fully efficient without a proper proportion of natives of talent and integrity in all grades? I consider the question here solely with reference to successful financial administration, independently of its very important social and, especially, political bearings, of the claims of right and justice, and of the great evil of no elders of wisdom or experience being prepared among the natives, as all the wisdom and experience of English officials is lost to India on their retirement, except perhaps of a few, who have conscience enough to feel the debt they owe to India, and to do what they can in England to promote its welfare.

2nd. Can the English officials, no matter however clever, manage the natives as well as natives of the same standing, ability, and integrity? A word of persuasion and assurance from a native of official position will, in the nature of things, carry more influence than that of an Englishman. A native will far more easily understand and know how to deal with the ways of natives. The assistance, therefore, of a proper proportion of natives in all departments is a necessity for successful organization and working of details. Even now it is the native in many instances

who is the real soul of the work, though the credit is all taken by his English superiors.

Conscientious men, like Sir Henry Ricketts, of the Bengal Civil Service, make no secret of such a circumstance, and rightly urge to let credit be given to whom it belongs. It is only natural that the Englishman, with his frequent changes and his ignorance of the people around him, is dependent upon, and at the mercy of, his subordinates. If there were in the service natives of the same position with himself, he would, by comparing notes with them, be much helped in understanding the feelings, views, and idiosyncrasies of natives, which he has no other means of learning.

Successful administration requires complete knowledge, and for such knowledge the co-operation of the natives is simply a necessity.

There is, moreover, the economical, and, therefore, the immediately financial, point of view from which this subject has to be considered. Supposing that the native official was paid as highly as his English colleague, the mere fact that all the earnings of the native official remain in the country, as he has no remittances to make to a foreign land for the education or maintenance of his children or family, or of his savings, is in itself so far an economical and, therefore, a financial advantage to the country; and it is the bounden duty of the English rulers to allow India this economical saving, consistently with their political supremacy. In some of the services, such as the Public Works, Telegraph, and Forest, political considerations have no place; while economy and justice, and the oft-repeated pledges of Parliament, demand that qualified natives should have free and fair admission into all the services. Unless this economical saving is allowed to India to a fair extent, all professions of administering the finances of India for the good of India cannot but be merely a mockery and delusion. Politically considered, it is not at all improbable that before long the English rulers of India will have some troublesome questions to solve, if due foresight is not used in this matter.

IV.—Principles of Design and Execution.

As a whole the questions are:—

1. Whether, by the present principles and modes of taxation, the burden is equitably distributed over the shoulders of all classes of people?
2. Whether the present expenditure is not capable of being largely curtailed, and much waste prevented, without impairing the efficiency or strength of the English rule?

To solve these two important questions it is necessary to work in the

way in which the Committee has already commenced, to examine the principle and necessity of each item of receipt and expenditure. Now, there is no doubt that the opinion of this governor, or that Revenue officer, or such a commander, may be worthy of all weight and respect; but, at the same time, in order that the Committee should arrive at an independent judgment of their own, it is necessary that they should not be satisfied with mere general opinions of the witnesses, but should require a clear statement of some satisfactory *proofs* upon which those opinions are based. I hope, therefore, that mere assertions of officials, that "all is right," will not be considered sufficient. For instance, we may take the question of the land revenue, which is the very subject the Committee has commenced with. There is a variety of land tenures, and each is based upon several principles. I take the instance of one of these principles—viz., the proportion of the rate of assessment to the income of the cultivator, or the produce of the land.

There are two questions. First, Are the principle or principles of the rates sound? and, second, if so, are the rate or rates adopted, such as to encourage increase of cultivation, lead to increase of capital, and thereby to increase of production and prosperity?

First take the *principles* of the rate.

In Bombay one and the chief principle of the last settlement seems to me to be this. It is illustrated by a table by Captain (now Sir George) Wingate and Lieut. Nash. (Bombay "Selection," No. CVII., New Series, page 14. See also pages 109 and 110.)

The soil is divided from No. 1 to No. 9. The gross produce of soil No. 1 is supposed, for illustration, to be Rs.172 4an. for every Rs.100 of cultivation expenses—*i.e.*, Rs.72 4an. is net produce; and for soil No. 9, the gross produce is supposed to be Rs.127 6an. 3p. for every Rs.100 of cultivation expenses—*i.e.*, Rs.27 6an. 3p. is net produce. The Government assessment is then adjusted as follows: Out of the net produce of Rs.27 6an. 3p. of No. 9 soil, the Government rate is, for supposition, taken as Rs.5 13an. 4p., leaving to the cultivator Rs.21 8an. 11p.—*i.e.*, something like 75 per cent. of the net produce. But what is proposed to be left to the cultivator of No. 1, whose net produce is Rs.72 4an.? One would think that, like the rate of the No. 9 soil, Government would take one-fourth, or say, Rs.18, and leave to the cultivator three-fourths, or Rs.54. Such, however, is not the case. The cultivator of No. 1 soil is also to keep only Rs.21 8an. 11p., and give up to Government Rs.50 11an. 1p.—that is, Government takes above two-thirds and the cultivator less than one-third; the principle being that, no matter what the net produce for every Rs.100 invested may be, every cultivator is not to have a definite proportion of his net produce, but an absolute fixed

quantity. This would be something like imposing the income-tax upon the principle that if one merchant makes a profit of 50*l.* on an investment of 100*l.*, and another of 10*l.* on the same investment, they are not to pay some definite proportion or proportions of their profits; but if the latter is to pay 2*l.* out of 10*l.*, and retain 8*l.*, the former should also retain 8*l.* only, and pay 42*l.* to Government. I wonder how British merchants and manufacturers would like this principle! However, it is not my object here to discuss the merit of this principle, but only to state it, for comparison with that of the other provinces.

Now take Madras. There the principle is, after allowing for ridges, boundaries, unproductive portions of fields, seasons, cultivation expenses, &c., to adjust the Government Assessment at two-thirds of the net produce on wet or irrigated lands, and a sort of compromise between two-thirds of net produce and one-fourth of gross produce on dry lands; the balance of about one-third of the net produce being left to the cultivator. ("Madras Selection," No. XIV., of 1869, pages 142—160, Settlement of Chellumbrum and Manargoody Talookas, of South Arcot.) Taking Punjaub, the principle of the first settlement was on the basis of two-thirds of the net produce, but by the revised settlement it is on one-half of the net produce for Government. In the N.W. Provinces (Adm. Report, '67-'68, page 47) "the standard of assessment is now 55 per cent. of the assets, of which 5 per cent. goes for cesses; the remaining 45 per cent., after defraying the village expenses, forms the profit of the proprietors."

To sum up the whole, I give an extract from a memorandum of the India House (Return 75, of 1858.) "And in all the improved systems of Revenue Administration, of which an account has been given in the preceding part of this paper, the object has not been merely to keep the Government demand *within the limits of a fair rent, but to leave a large portion of the rent to the proprietors.* In the settlement of the N.W. Provinces, the demand was limited to two-thirds of the amount, which it appeared, from the best attainable information, that the land could afford to pay *as rent.* The principle which has been laid down for the next settlement, and acted on wherever settlement has commenced, is still more liberal; the Government demand being fixed at one-half instead of two-thirds of the *average net produce—that is, of a fair rent.* The same general standard has been adopted for guidance in the new settlement of the Madras territory. In Bombay no fixed proportion has been kept in view, but the object has been that land should possess a saleable value." (The italics are mine.)

Now, in giving this extract I have also the object of directing attention to the use of the words "net produce" and "fair rent" as

synonymous. Is it so? Is the *net produce*, of which one-half is settled as Government assessment, *rent* only in the sense in which economists use that word, and for "leaving a large portion of which" Government claims credit of liberality?

Now to the next question. Taking the *absolute* amount of the net produce, is the portion allowed to the cultivators sufficient, on an average, for their year's ordinary wants of common necessaries, and some reasonable comforts, together with a saving to face a bad season, or to increase the capital of the country for increasing production?

The test of "the satisfaction of the ryots" is often quoted as a proof of soundness. But it requires to be ascertained whether because an element like that of fixity of tenure and non-interference for a long period is felt satisfactory, it follows that the other elements or principles of the settlement are also necessarily satisfactory or just, even though, as a general result, the agriculturists may feel themselves somewhat better off than they were before? Or is the fact of such profits as the Bombay Presidency had the good fortune to make from the late American war, and the improvement of condition by railways, though a cause of satisfaction to the cultivators, a proof of the soundness or justness of each and all the principles adopted in the settlement? To come to a right conclusion, each principle requires to be examined on its own merits, without reference to general results; for, if *all* the principles were sound, much more satisfactory may be the results.

The Bombay settlement, as well as that of other parts, is now under revision. It is important to ascertain the real present incidence of land revenue, and the reasonable increase that may be made, with sufficient left to the cultivator to subsist on and to save for increase of capital. I am afraid the Bombay re-settlement is not quite reasonable.

I shall take one or two more instances in connection with land revenue. Whether the zemindars of the permanent settlement can be taxed for extra cesses has been the subject of much controversy and dissatisfaction, and even up to the present day the India Office is divided against itself. Now, as long as mere opinions of this official or that Indian Secretary are the sole guides, I do not see how the controversy will ever end. It is a simple question of documentary evidence—the interpretation of a regulation. Would it not be the best plan to subject this question to the decision of a judicial authority, such as the Privy Council, after hearing the arguments of counsel on both sides? The decision of such a tribunal must end the matter. The same course, either on the original side of the High Court of Bombay, or in the Privy Council, might be adopted with regard to the extra anna-cess imposed upon the existing Bombay settlements. I believe it is the opinion of many that it was a

breach of faith on the part of Government. A decision of a competent judicial tribunal would be satisfactory to all parties.

The *prestige* of the British name for good faith should never be in the least imperilled, if it is to exert for Government the moral influence it possesses, independently of political and other reasons.

Lastly, in reference to the principles of the land revenue, as a part of the whole design, is the burden of taxation on the cultivator of land in an equitable proportion with other classes? Government claims the rights of a landlord. Does that mean that Government *must* have a certain portion of the produce, no matter even though the exaction be inequitably higher than that from other classes of people? Or is the Government demand upon land to be adjusted on the principle that Government requiring a certain revenue, the land should pay its equitable quota with all other industries? or is it that, because richer interests can resort to agitation, and make themselves heard, while the poor labourer and cultivator cannot, it is felt easier to squeeze them than the other classes?

II. Is the machinery for the collection of the land revenue sufficiently economical? I think the evidence of a person like Dewan Kazi Shahabudin, for the Bombay side, will be valuable; for, as a native revenue official, as he once was, he knows the feelings and views of the natives in a way and to an extent which it is almost impossible for an English official to acquire.

After this one instance of the land revenue, I do not think I need go into the details of the other items of the Budget further than to say that the test of Questions I. and II. under the fourth head has to be rigidly applied to all the items; and to ascertain whether the system of keeping accounts is such as it should be. I shall take only one more item. The salt-tax, especially, requires most anxious consideration. It is the cause of the poor, who cannot speak for or help themselves. Is it at all right to tax salt; and, even allowing the necessity, is the incidence of its burden on the poor similar to that on the other classes for the share they pay towards revenue?

The salt gross revenue for different parts is as follows for 1869-70 :—
(Ret. c. 213 of 1870.)

		Population about	Per head about s.	d.
Bengal	£2,583,562	40,000,000	1	3½
Oudh.....	1,219	11,000,000	—	
Central Provinces	115,167	9,000,000	0	3
N.W. Provinces...	488,728	30,000,000	0	4
Punjaub.....	923,060	17,500,000	1	0½
Madras	1,164,736	23,000,000	1	0
Bombay.....	599,407	14,000,000	0	10
Total	5,875,879	144,500,000	0	9¾ average

Now, taking the share of the agricultural produce which can be considered as left to the mass of the poor, agricultural, and other common labouring population, to be 20s. a-head, an ordinary Coolie or workman pays in his salt some 4 per cent. out of his wretched pittance. But it must also be borne in mind that 4 per cent. out of 20s. is far more important to the poor man than 10 or 20 per cent. out of the income of the richer classes. Taking 25s. a-head, the rate will be $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

Of the four elements I have described above, the first three are essentially questions for Parliament.

1. It is Parliament alone that can decide what the financial relations between England and India should be; how far the guarantee of England can be given for the alleviation of the burden of the public debt, which is the result of English wars in India, or other countries of Asia; and how far the benefit of England's credit and capital can be given to help in the restoration of India's prosperity and prevention of famines.

2. It is Parliament alone that can modify the constitution of the Legislative Council and the Indian Council, or give the people of India such a fair voice in their own affairs as they are now capable of exercising, because these Councils are the creation of an Act of Parliament.

3. It is Parliament alone that can insist on the faithful fulfilment of the repeated pledges they have given by Acts of Parliament for the admission of natives into the various services, according to competence and character, and without any regard to caste, creed, colour, or race. In the Public Works Department there is a farce of a regulation to admit natives in India on proof of competence; but very good care is taken that natives do *not* get in. On the Bombay side, as far back as 1861, three natives proved their competence (and one did the same in 1866), and to my knowledge none of them had found admission into the Engineering Department up to 1868. Whether they have since been admitted I do not know, though during the interval dozens of appointments have been given every year. English interests exercise such pressure upon the Indian Governments, that unless Parliament does its duty and insists that, in accordance with its pledges, justice shall be done to the children of the soil, there is but little hope on that score.

4. The principles of the whole design of Financial Administration, or of its details, will have always, more or less, to be settled and controlled by the Indian Governments themselves, according to change of circumstances. The best service, therefore, that Parliament can do on this head—and which Parliament alone can do—is to inquire, at certain reasonable intervals—say every ten or twelve years—how the Indian Governments have discharged their trust. This simple necessary control of the great Parliament of the

Empire will prevent many of those evils which freedom from a sense of responsibility induces, and infuse into the Administration all that care and forethought necessary to its success.

May, 1871.

After I had posted the foregoing part of this pamphlet from Alexandria, I came across a speech of Lord Mayo, in the *Times of India's* summary, of 8th April last. I read one paragraph in it with feelings of mixed regret and hopefulness; regret, that one in the position of a Viceroy should have put forth what, in my humble opinion, is an erroneous and misleading statement; and hopefulness, because now that the Viceroy has directed his attention to the all-important subject of the insufficient production of the country, he will, I hope, be able to grapple with it, investigate its causes and evil consequences, and earnestly endeavour to apply suitable remedies.

I refer here to the paragraph in which his Excellency endeavours to refute the assertion that Indian taxation is "crushing." His lordship on this point has made several assumptions, which require examination. I shall, therefore, first consider whether the conclusion drawn is legitimate, and whether all necessary elements of comparison have been taken into account.

Last year, in my paper on "The Wants and Means of India," which was read before the East India Association, a rough estimate was given of the total production of India (including opium, salt, minerals, manufactures—in short, production of every kind) as about 40s. a-head per annum.

Mr. Grant Duff, in his speech of 24th February last, referred to the relative incomes of England and India, and endeavoured to show that while the former was estimated at 30*l.* a-head, the latter was "guessed" as 40s. a-head per annum. Now, his lordship the Viceroy quotes Mr. Duff's statement of 40s., and believes that Mr. Duff has good reasons for his statement. So that we have it now on the highest authority that the total production of India is only 40s. a-head per annum.

His Excellency the Viceroy, after admitting this fact, compares the taxation of India with that of some other countries. In doing this, his lordship deducts as land revenue (*whether rightly or wrongly, will be seen hereafter*) the opium, tributes, and other small receipts from Indian taxation, and then compares the balance with the taxation of other countries. Being on board a steamer in the Red Sea, I cannot refer to returns to see whether his lordship has made any similar deductions from the

taxation of the latter. The result of the comparison would appear to be that, while India pays only 1s. 10d. per head of taxation per annum, Turkey pays 7s. 9d., Russia 12s. 2d., Spain 18s. 5d., Austria 19s. 7d., and Italy 17s. per head per annum. The conclusion drawn is that the taxation of India is not "crushing." What idea his lordship attaches to the word "crushing" I cannot say, but his lordship seems to forget the very first premise that the total production of the country is admitted to be 40s. per head. Now, this amount is hardly enough for the bare necessaries of life, much less can it supply any comforts or provide any reserve for bad times; so that, living from hand to mouth, and that on "scanty subsistence" (in the words of Lord Lawrence), the very touch of famine carries away hundreds of thousands. Is not this in itself as "crushing" to any people as it can possibly be? And yet out of this wretched income they have to pay taxation as well.

His lordship has, moreover, left out a very important element from account. He is well aware that, whatever revenue is raised by the other countries, for instance, the 70,000,000*l.* by England, the whole of it returns back to the people and remains *in* the country; and, therefore, the national capital, upon which the production of a country depends, does not suffer diminution; while, on account of India's being subject to a foreign rule, out of the 50,000,000*l.* of revenue raised every year, some 12,000,000*l.*, or more, are carried clear away to England, and the national capital—or, in other words, its capability of production—is continuously diminished year after year. The pressure of taxation, therefore, if proper remedies are not adopted to counteract the above evil, must, necessarily, become more and more crushing every year, even though the amount of taxation be not increased. It is quite intelligible that the English people, with an income or production of some 30*l.* per head, aided by or including some 12,000,000*l.*, or more, annually drawn from India, may not feel the taxation of 2*l.* 10s. a-head as crushing; or the nations which his lordship has instanced, having no price of some 12,000,000*l.* annually to pay for a foreign rule, and being, most probably, able to produce enough for all their wants, may not feel the 7s. to 19s. 7d. as crushing; but, in my humble opinion, every single ounce of rice taken from the "scanty subsistence" of the masses of India is to them so much more starvation, and so much more "crushing."

I shall now consider what would have been the fairest way of making the comparison of taxation. Every nation has a certain amount of income from various sources, such as production of cultivation, minerals, farming, manufactures, profits of trade, &c. From such total income all its wants are to be supplied. A fair comparison as to the incidence of taxation will be to see the proportion of the amount which

the Government of the country takes for its administration, public debts, &c., to the total income. You may call this amount taxation, revenue, or anything you like; and Government may take it in any shape or way whatsoever. It is so much taken from the income of the country for the purposes of government. In the case of India, whether Government takes this amount as land tax, or opium revenue, or in whatever other form, does not matter, it is all the same, that out of the total income of the country Government raises so much revenue for its purposes which otherwise would have remained with the people.

Taking, therefore, this fair test of the incidence of taxation, the results will be that England raises 70,000,000*l.* out of the national income of some 900,000,000*l.*—that is, about 8 per cent., or about 2*l.* 10s. per head, from an income of about 30*l.* per head; whereas the Indian Government raises 50,000,000*l.* out of a national income of 300,000,000*l.*—that is, about 16 per cent., or 6s. 8d. per head, out of an income of 40s. per head.

Had his lordship stated the total national income and population of the countries with which he has made the comparison, we would have then seen what the per-centage of their revenue to their income was, and from how much income per head the people had to pay their 7s. to 19s. 7d. per head of taxation, as quoted by his lordship.

Further, if in consequence of a constant drain from India from its poor production, the income of the country continues to diminish, the per-centage of taxation to income will be still greater, even though the amount of taxation may not increase. But, as we know that the tendency of taxation in India has, during the past twelve years, been to go on increasing every year, the pressure will necessarily become more and more oppressive and crushing, unless our rulers by proper means restore India to at least a healthy, if not a wealthy, condition. It must, moreover, be particularly borne in mind that, while a ton may not be any burden to an elephant, a few pounds may crush a child; that the English nation may, from its average income of 30*l.* a-head, bear with ease a burden of even 5*l.* or 10*l.* of taxation per head, while, to the Indian nation, 5s. out of 40s. may be quite unbearable and crushing. The capacity to bear a burden with ease or to be crushed by it, is not to be measured by the per-centage of taxation, but by the abundance, or otherwise, of the means or income to pay it from. From abundance you may give a large per-centage with ease; from sufficiency, the same burden may be just bearable, or some diminution may make it so; but from insufficiency, any burden is so much privation.

But as matters stand, poor India has to pay not only the same per-centage of taxation to its income as in England, but nearly double; *i.e.*,

while England pays only about 8½ per cent. of its national income for the wants of its Government, India has to pay some 16 per cent. of its income for the same purpose; though here that income per head of population is some fifteenth part of that of England, and insufficient in itself for even its ordinary wants, leaving alone the extraordinary political necessity to pay a foreign country for its rule.

I sincerely trust, and very hopefully look forward, that when those in whose hands the destiny of India is now placed—such as Mr. Grant Duff, the members of the India Office, the Viceroy, and Sir R. Temple—understand this great evil, it will not be long before really effectual remedies shall be adopted, with the assistance of Parliament. Parliament being the fountain of all power, and as the Indian Government can only act as Parliament directs, it becomes its bounden duty to God and man to lay down the great principles of a just, efficient, and beneficent government for the administration of India, and to see from time to time to their being acted on.

In stating the Viceroy's views, I am obliged to trust to memory, but I hope I have not mis-stated them. Now that we have the testimony of the two latest Viceroys—Lord Lawrence stating that the mass of the people live on scanty subsistence, and Lord Mayo believing Mr. Grant Duff's statement of the income of India being only 40s. a-head per annum as well founded—the Select Committee may not think it necessary to ask for any returns, but take the fact as proved. Perhaps the time thus saved to the Select Committee may be well employed in ascertaining the best remedies for such a deplorable state of affairs, and it may not seem very reasonable to request the Committee to put the India Office to the trouble of making any returns on this subject. But I hope that, though the Select Committee may not now think it necessary to ask for any returns for its own use, it will recommend—or the Indian Government will, of its own accord, require—the return of a table of total income of the country as an essential part of the annual Administration Reports of all the different provinces, and embody it in the return now annually published, showing the moral and material progress. The Houses of Parliament and the English and the Indian public will then be able to see every year clearly what the material condition of India really is, and how far measures are adopted to improve the present state of matters. To prepare returns of the total production of the country, there are ample materials in the tables required by the Calcutta Statistical Committee in the Administration Reports. All that is necessary is simple calculation. For instance, one table gives the total acreage of cultivated land in each district; another table gives the acreage of the different crops grown; a third table gives the produce per acre of each kind of crop; a fourth table gives the prices

of the produce in the markets of the districts. Now it is easy to see that, with these materials, the value of the total produce of all the districts of a province can be easily worked out.

An erroneous principle has crept into the Administration Reports. I have already once referred to it in connection with the question of prices. I point it out here again, so that it may be avoided in this important calculation. In the above tables of the Administration Reports averages are taken, for instance, of the prices of all the districts of the province, by adding up the prices of the different districts and dividing the total by the number of districts. This is evidently absurd, for one district may have produced a million of tons of rice, and may sell it at R.1 a-maund, and another may have produced only a thousand tons, and the price there may be Rs.5 a-maund. It will be incorrect to make the average price as Rs.3 per maund, when it will actually be only a little more than R.1. In the same manner the produce per acre may be very large in one place where probably the acreage under cultivation also is very large, while in another district the cultivated acreage may be small and the produce per acre may be small also. If the average is taken by simply adding up the produce per acre of each district, and dividing by the number of districts, the total of the produce thus obtained will be less than the actual quantity. Avoiding this mistake in the principle of taking averages, from the above-mentioned tables can be calculated the total production of cultivated land. Then there are other sources of income to be added, such as stock, opium, salt, minerals, manufactures, fisheries, &c. The Reports already have the figures for most of these items, and thus the grand total of income available for human consumption and saving may be ascertained. Such a return, with two others I shall refer to hereafter for every province, would be of great importance.

If this calculation of the total income of the country is made out every year, we shall have the most direct evidence of the actual condition of the people, instead of being obliged to draw inferences indirectly from the complicated and misleading phenomena of differences of prices or wages.

Except Bengal, all the provinces have the means of obtaining the necessary materials for the different tables required by the Statistical Committee. In Bengal, the perpetual settlement, I think, makes it unnecessary for the Revenue Department to ascertain the actual extent of the whole cultivation, and of the different crops. But for such an important purpose, I have no doubt, the Bengal Government will devise some means to procure the necessary information. In the Report for 1869-70, they have, I think, intimated their intention to do what they can.

Not commanding the time and the means necessary for minute calcu-

lations, I have made a rough estimate, and I think that if averages are worked out by the statistical staff at the India Office or at Calcutta, the result will be very nearly what Mr. Duff has stated, and which his Excellency the Viceroy adopts—viz., a total income of about 40s. a-head per annum. From this, the European residents and the richer classes of natives above the common labourer get a larger proportion, and the portion remaining for the mass of the people must, therefore, be much less.

It must also be remembered that this average of 40s. per head is for the whole of India; but for the different Presidencies or Provinces, each of which is as large and as populous as some of the countries of Europe, the proportion of distribution of this total production is very different. For instance, in Bombay the total production, if accurately worked out, may be found to be 100s. a-head, Punjaub perhaps about 45s. to 50s. a-head; consequently the other provinces will have under 40s. a-head. Then, again, there is another drawback—viz., the want of cheap communication—by which even this insufficient production of 45s. a-head is not fully utilized, so as to allow the plenty of one Presidency to be available for the population of another. Not only does this difficulty of distribution exist between different Presidencies, but even between parts of the same province. I shall give just one instance—that of the Central Provinces. While at Raipore and Belaspore the price of rice at the end of 1867-8 was R.1 for a maund of 80lbs., at Hosungabad it was Rs.5 per maund, at Baitool it was Rs.4 per maund, at Jubbulpore Rs.3 12 ans. per maund. In this way, while in one district a part of the produce was perhaps rotting or being wasted, other districts were suffering from scarcity.

Upon the whole, I think the average income per head of the poor labouring population of all the provinces (except Bombay and Punjaub) will be found hardly above 20s. a-head per annum, or, may be, from 20s. to 25s.

This can be tested directly if the Administration Reports give, in addition to the return for the total income of the province, a second return, something like the following (I believe they have all the requisite materials, or can obtain them):—The number of people living upon unskilled labour, and rates of wages, with details; the number of adults (male and female) capable of work, say between twenty-one and fifty; the number of youths, say from twelve to twenty-one years of age (male and female); the number of the old incapable of work, or, say, above fifty years of age; the number of children under twelve years of age; the average wage earned by males and females of the above different classifications (calculating the average on the correct principle of taking the *number* of labourers earning each rate into account); the number of the sick and infirm; and the number of days during the year that the

different rates of wages are earned. From these materials it will be easy to ascertain the real average income of the unskilled labourer, who forms the majority of the population, and upon whose labour depends the subsistence of the nation. I hope the India Office will order such returns to be prepared for the Select Committee. It will be a direct proof of the actual condition of the mass of the people of each Presidency, and will be a great help to the Committee.

I may now give a few particulars, which are at hand, of the cost of living, for the bare necessaries of life.

The Bombay Report for 1867-68 gives Rs.41 13 ans. 10 p. as the average cost for diet per prisoner, and Rs.5 10 ans. 11 p. for clothing and bedding. The N.W. Provinces Report gives the average cost for central gaols—for diet, Rs.18 1 an. 8¾ p.; for clothing and bedding, Rs.3 5 ans. 1¼ p. For divisional gaols—for diet, Rs.24 6 ans. 10¼ p.; and clothing and bedding, Rs.4 3 ans. 4½ p.; and for district gaols—for diet, Rs.15 8 ans. 17¾ p.; and for clothing and bedding, Rs.3 2 ans. 6 p. In the Central Provinces, the cost for diet is Rs.25½, and for clothing and bedding Rs.5½; and in the Punjaub — for diet, Rs.23 6 ans.; for clothing and bedding, Rs.31 13 ans. 6 p.

This is what the State thinks it necessary to give to criminals as bare necessaries of life. There may be some little allowance to be made for the proportion of females and the young being smaller in a prison than in the outside world. Making this allowance, can it be said that the labourer gets the necessaries of life to this extent? To this has to be added some cost for lodging, something for reasonable social wants, and something to save for a bad day or old age. Do the people get this?

Surgeon S. B. Partridge, Government Medical Inspector of Emigrants, in a statement dated Calcutta, 26th March, 1870,* proposes the following as a scale of diet, to supply the necessary ingredients of nourishment, for the emigrant coolies during their voyage, living in a state of quietude:—

Rice Diet for One Man.	ozs.		For Flour Diet.	ozs.	
Rice	20	0	Flour	16	0
Dhal	6	0	Dhal	4	0
Preserved Mutton	2	5	Preserved Mutton	2	5
Vegetables	4	27	Vegetables	4	27
Ghee	1	0	Ghee	1	5
Mustard Oil	0	5	Mustard Oil	0	5
Salt	1	0	Salt	1	0
Total	35	27	Total	29	77

* The *Indian Economist* of 15th October, 1870; "Statistical Reporter," p. 45.

This is absolutely necessary to supply the necessary ingredients of nitrogen and carbon; not the slightest luxury—no sugar, tea, or any little enjoyment of life—but simple animal subsistence.

From the above data, returns can be worked out, at the prices of particular districts and provinces, of the absolute necessaries of life, which will show whether a province produces enough for these, and for all its political, social, economical, and administrative wants. With these three returns—first, of the total income per head per annum; secondly, the average per head of the earnings of the mass of the labouring population; and, thirdly, the average actual requirements per head for all the different absolutely necessary wants of the labouring population—the ruler of every province will be able to give a clear picture of the actual material condition of his charge, and will get any credit he may deserve for the improvements made by him. I hope the India Office will place these three returns before the Select Committee. Complacent assertions of officials that all are happy and prospering can be had in any quantity; but unless the test of actual facts is applied by such returns, these assertions are not only worth nothing, but are positively mischievous, as they mislead Parliament and the English public, who, believing such statements, become indifferent to India, to be roused only by some great calamity, either physical or political.

If the facts brought to light by these returns show that the people are really suffering from insufficiency to supply their absolute wants for ordinary healthy human life, and that, therefore, having no reserve either of strength or means, or no intelligence, they are easily swept away by hundreds of thousands in time of scarcity, what a responsibility lies upon our British rulers to remedy this wretchedness! Remedy it *they could*, if they but chose to set about their work with a due sense of their responsibility, and with earnestness and determination. India needs the help of their capital and credit, needs reduction in expenditure, needs an efficient and economical administration, of which native co-operation must form an essential, and not an incidental element, needs a wise and fair adjustment of her financial relations with England, and, finally and imperatively, a wise and rapid diffusion of the blessings of Education.

MEETING AT THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1871.

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR VINCENT EYRE, K.C.S.I., IN THE CHAIR.

Sir Bartle Frere's Address on "The Means of Ascertaining Public Opinion in India."

THE CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen: It is always a most satisfactory thing when an important subject falls into competent hands for discussion, and I think we may congratulate ourselves this evening on such a circumstance, inasmuch as probably one of the most important problems affecting the well-being of our great Indian Empire is about to be handled, and, I hope, brought to a satisfactory solution, by one who is well known to you all as one of the most popular and able administrators of our Indian Empire. My only dissatisfaction on this occasion is to find myself where I am. I have no qualification which entitles me to preside except that of having the honour to be one of the Members of the Council of the East India Association. Having been called upon to do so, I have undertaken that post merely as a matter of duty, feeling convinced that there are many here present who would be much more at home in this chair, and much better able to perform the duties appertaining to it. I now call upon Sir Bartle Frere to address the meeting.

Sir BARTLE FRERE.—I cannot pretend in anything I could say to *solve*—as your Chairman proposes—any question connected with the subject before us this evening. I can only offer for your consideration a very few of the many points which strike one as soon as we begin to consider the question of public opinion with reference to India; and to express a hope that the subject, which I know has received the attention of a great many of the wisest thinkers, and of those best entitled to instruct the public, being once started, may lead to its being more fully discussed; because I feel convinced that there is no subject connected with India which more imperatively demands careful consideration, and requires being brought from the region of discussion into the region of action.

The first question that suggests itself as soon as one presumes to talk about public opinion in India, is the question which is very often asked, and almost always asked in a tone which rather implies an inevitable negative answer, "Is there such a thing as public opinion in India?" Now I always feel inclined to answer this question after the

Scotch fashion, with another question, and to ask whether people in India think and feel and speak to one another like men in other parts of the world; because, supposing there is no essential difference between the mental constitution and faculties and habits of intercommunication of men in India and of men in other parts of the world, I hold that it follows inevitably that there must be such a thing as public opinion in that great country. But let us consider for a moment, What do we mean when we talk of public opinion? It is clearly not the same as *published opinion*, though often confounded with it; for there is public opinion, often very strong in expression and action, where there can be no publication, as, to take a familiar instance, in the case of a great public school, and many large and influential bodies among ourselves who have, as we say, "no recognised organ of public opinion," no means of making the public opinion which exists within the body known to those outside it by means of publication through a periodical press. Without detaining you with any attempt at elaborate definition, I would simply say that what I mean, and what I think may be accepted as a sufficiently accurate practical definition for the moment, is, *any opinion which is not personal nor peculiar, and which is shared and more or less expressed by large bodies of men.* In this sense it exists, of course, in India as it exists everywhere else in the civilised world. The next question that suggests itself is, "In what does public opinion in India differ from public opinion in other parts of the world?" Let us take, as the strongest comparison possible, perhaps, our own country. I should say that the difference consisted mainly in Indian public opinion being less articulate, and more rarely expressed in a way which will reach English ears. That is the only difference, as far as I am aware, between public opinion in India and public opinion in this country. And let us consider that even in this country it is no very easy thing to arrive at an accurate conception of what public opinion on any given question is. We have, perhaps, in England, the best possible means with which any country in the world is blessed of learning what is the public opinion, as far as it can be arrived at, through the medium of a thoroughly well-instructed, independent, able, and numerous Press, and by a perfect network of magistracy and clergy and private and public officials all over the country, through whom public opinion may be gathered by anybody who makes it his business to ascertain it, as all our statesmen necessarily do. And yet I would beg you to mark in passing how frequently it happens even in this country, with all our advantages, that not only single statesmen, but large bodies of statesmen, find themselves occasionally quite mistaken as to the true bearing of public opinion on particular questions of national policy. We have had

instances of the kind within our own memories, where whole parties in the State, and the Press, with very few exceptions, found themselves in error till the nation was appealed to, and then they discovered that there had been a strong undercurrent of public opinion which had found no adequate expression, which was only audible to those who had the most delicate ear and feeling, as it were, for the pulse of the people, but which was ultimately expressed with a strength of will which left no question as to what the opinion of the public really was. If such a difficulty exists in England, how much more must it be the case in India, where our means of arriving at public opinion are very much more limited; and how very much greater must be the dangers of ignorance of public opinion in that country than they are in this! I would only refer to one or two examples, which will be in the memory of all who are at all connected with India. I would refer to the Affghan War, which was undertaken, no doubt, mainly through a very mistaken impression as to the bearing of a great political event (the advance of Russia) upon public opinion in India. If we had known public opinion then as we know it now, I do not think we should have rushed so precipitately into a war which cost us so much both in money and in credit, and in what is dearer than either, in the lives and characters of many of our great men. Still more recently we have had the Indian Mutiny. There were men (we have some of them here among us this day) who knew what was at the time the public opinion of the great masses of India on some of the disturbing questions which led to the mutiny. But the majority of the governing body in India was not aware what that public opinion would have said if its sentiments had been heard, and the consequence was that we were taken, as you all know, very much by surprise; and, what is worse, when the danger was for the time overcome, we were much inclined to attribute the mutiny to other than the true causes. And this brings me to the next question (and I am obliged to touch very briefly upon all these questions), one which I am sorry to say is very frequently asked, and asked generally in rather a cynical tone, "Who cares for public opinion in India—and how have we got on so long and so well in India without any special reference to public opinion?" People who ask this question are very apt to quote the well known dictum of the Duke of Wellington, that he never met people who were so completely philosophical about all questions relating to their government as the people of India; and they tell you broadly that public opinion is not a thing to be much cared for by the men who are trusted with the administration of India. Now this is a feeling which, with more or less distinctness, is very apt to find expression in these days; but I need not tell you that this was not the feeling which

actuated the old Indians of former days. And let us for the moment consider how the India of former days differed from the India of the present day. In the first place it was the India of perpetual conquests. There is nobody who has served in India during the first half of this century who does not recollect that no period of ten years elapsed without some conquest or extension of dominion, which brought with it generally, as a consequence, peace to a country which had been for a long time the theatre of more or less disorder and war, and for the moment brought also lightened taxation. Now, these were marks of an era which has now passed away. I would ask you to reflect on the men who were during that time the great actors in the history of India, and see if you can find any of those who were eminent and were known as wise and able administrators who disregarded the public opinion of the natives. I have only to remind you of a very few of the names of men of this class, and you will at once recognise that they were as a body distinguished, whatever may have been their other differences, by the respect they paid and the weight they attributed to the public opinion of the people over whom they ruled. There was Sir John Malcolm, whose writings are to this day a perfect mine of practical knowledge on the principles of sound administration in India. There were the Munros, the Elphinstones, Metcalf, Sir Henry Lawrence, and Sir George Clerk, of Umballa: any man who was in India in his time will recollect what an immense force he represented at the time when he was almost the only Englishman within fifty or a hundred miles of his camp; and that force mainly consisted in his power of estimating the opinion of the natives about him. Then there was Sutherland, in Rajpootana, of whom we have Lord Ellenborough's testimony that he looked upon Sutherland's being struck down by illness as equivalent to a loss of 10,000 men. He said he considered him as worth 10,000 men in keeping Rajpootana in order. That was one of those old Indians whose main characteristic was that he felt the pulse of the people among whom he dwelt. Then there were the Skinners, and Outram, and Edwards, whose great characteristic was like that of the other men who have been named, that they thoroughly understood by a sort of sympathy with the people what they felt and what they were going to do. And above all, there is, perhaps, the most remarkable instance of any, that of Sir Charles Napier, remarkable most especially in this, that arriving in India long after the age at which men are most capable of receiving vivid impressions, he, by his intuitive knowledge of mankind, at once grasped the secret of managing the people by attempting to understand the feelings which actuated them. His feeling, and that of all the men I have named, on that subject was that he who would, as one of a very, very

small minority, rule in a foreign country, must, above all things, understand the feelings and opinions of the people of that country.

How does modern India differ from the old India I have described? I am the last man in the world to undervalue the great improvements which have taken place in India, in almost every branch of administration; but let us mark well the differences which distinguish it from the India of our early youth. First of all, you have a completely new generation of people. They are a people who have not known generally what it is to be visited with a war, what it is to suffer from the presence of a hostile enemy harrying their country. Most of these things they may have heard from their fathers and grandfathers, but they have lost the sense of the presence of the evil, from which the swords of our immediate predecessors, and of some among ourselves, helped to deliver their fathers. Then they are a people, the leaders of thought among whom have an English education, such as many of our own children might envy. Well-educated young Indians in these days have been taught all that we would teach our own children of the great masters of English thought and English literature. I do not look upon it as a matter of any particular glory that we should have laid open to them these things. I think it would have been to our eternal shame had we not done so; but when we have put into their hands the weapon, we must not wonder that they should use it, and that they should look upon themselves—as I think most thoughtful men among us would wish them to do—as having the same rights and being entitled to the same privileges as all the other subjects of the British Sovereign. This is a change which we would do well to bear in mind, because it is one of immense importance. And coupled with this there is a system of government which necessarily involves much more desk work, much more of every kind of sedentary work, and gives less opportunity for mixing with the natives. There is at the same time easier intercourse with England, which none of us would grudge our countrymen the benefit of, much more rapid communication in every way by letter and in person with our home friends; and, as a consequence, those people among whom our fellow-servants are labouring in India get a less amount of personal attention and thought than was the custom in old times. This is the inevitable consequence, and we might as well try to make the sun go back in its course as to alter this condition of things. But still let us not forget that it exists, and, moreover, that the members of the administration, and the people whose affairs are administered, all share in the high pressure at which everything is working in this generation; they, as well as we, feel the accelerated pulse which is coursing through the veins of the body politic in every direction, and all these

changes make, perhaps, a greater impression in India than similar changes have done in this country, because we have come upon them gradually, whereas to India every change has come suddenly—what to us has been the work of two or three centuries has come upon them in half a generation. Then, in the midst of all these changes, comes the pressure of financial difficulties. I will not say a word now as to how far these might have been avoided, or how far they were inevitable; but the fact remains, that at this present moment there *are* financial difficulties of a very serious character oppressing the minds of all our Indian statesmen, and that this is the time when, as all history teaches us, governments have most reason to beware of how they walk, and to look warily to the feelings of those over whom they rule. Let us only turn to the pages of our own history, and consider how, all the time that great opinions were growing and changing, and new forces were being developed, all through the Tudor age, things went on pretty smoothly and without any great difficulty, up to the time when Charles I. found himself in financial difficulties, which obliged him to resort to new taxation. That, as all history tells us, in our own country and everywhere else, is the time when the difficulties of a government increase, and render it absolutely necessary that they should consider the temper of the people over whom they rule. However despotic they may be, whatever may be their power of imposing taxes, yet let governments take warning from the example of our own Charles I., from the example of Louis XVI. among our neighbours, and, in our own time, examples such as that of the Austrian Empire, and let them remember that, after all, whatever may be the other difficulties of a government, financial difficulties are the real strain which tests the power of a government over its subjects.

I will merely remind you, that in what I am now saying to you, however little we may hear the subject generally discussed, I am not speaking at all on a subject which is new to those who have thought much about the condition of India; in fact I believe there is nothing which I could say to you this evening which has not been already thought of, and a great deal of it put upon record, by wiser and abler men in other parts of England and India. But for the most part their thoughts have not found public expression, and it is because I believe till they find public expression, and till the matter comes to be faced and discussed, there is a very serious danger in reticence, that I venture now to bring the subject prominently to your notice.

I will just read you a few extracts from the evidence that was lately given by a man who has perhaps a better knowledge of the natives than almost any existing servant of the Indian Government —Sir Donald

Macleod—who, as you know, has only very lately returned to this country, and who, after doing such excellent service in the Punjaub, has come to this country with the reputation of knowing the natives better than almost any man in the Punjaub; and this is what he stated only a very short time ago publicly. He was asked before the Committee which is now sitting on the Finances of India, "whether, supposing a larger revenue were required from the Punjaub, he would recommend an increase of the duty on salt?" He replied: "I think it might be realised. But before expressing a decided opinion on a point of that kind I should like to consult the natives more than we do generally." He was then asked again on the same subject, and he replied: "I would be very cautious about expressing a definitive opinion about any tax until I had had an opportunity of discussing with natives regarding it." Further, he was asked: "You think it would be unwise, generally, to propose any new tax or to increase any existing tax until the natives have been more fully consulted?" He replied: "I think, myself, it is most desirable before anything is done, for we really do not know what would be the result, unless one did consult them." Let me remind you that these are not opinions expressed by any mere doctrinaire man of the desk, but they are opinions expressed by a man who has been all his life in practical hard work among the natives of the Punjaub, and he is a man who has proved throughout the stress of the mutiny that he is not made of metal to give way lightly before any form of physical force. I used to hear from him almost every day at the time when the fate of Delhi hung in the balance, and I can testify that at that time there was not a man in the whole of India who possessed a more balanced courage, and a more determined feeling that he would fight it out to the end, than the man who expresses these opinions now, and expresses them as the matured opinions of his whole lifetime. I may add that I believe those opinions are shared by many of his companions, many of those who have worked with him, in that great dependency which he has so well ruled.

Let us, then, take it for granted, and I think we are entitled to do so, that there is such a thing as public opinion in India, and that it is of great importance to know what it says, and let us consider for a moment how we are to learn what it says. What are the channels through which we might expect to learn something about public opinion in India? First of all, of course, there are what are called the usual channels of public opinion, and no man in this room is more alive to the value of the Periodical Press than I am. With regard to its growth in India, I have known it from the days when, with the exception of one or two papers in Calcutta, the whole of the editorial staff of India was com-

posed, without exception, of amateurs; and all the newspaper writing was amateur newspaper writing. I have watched its growth till it has become a great power in the State, and I will venture to say that there is no press out of London which is conducted with greater ability, with greater independence, and, on the whole, with greater regard to the public interests than the Press of India; but at the same time let me remind you that the Press of India represents the opinions of a mere fraction of the masses of India. It represents, generally, the opinion of very able and skilful men, who gather as far as they can the opinions of those around them; but in that vast country their views are necessarily limited to the powers of human vision, and they find themselves looking into blank space when they look more than a few score of miles from the place where their Press is situated; and with regard to the opinions of the great mass of the cultivators and of the industrial population of India, you may say that it is a mere reflection of distant light which reaches the best-informed of our English editors of Indian newspapers. What they collect they make the best use of, but it is difficult for them to collect more than a very small portion of what we want to know. But then we are told that there is a very large and increasing Native Press. When I recollect the time when there was only a single native newspaper in Bombay, when there were only one or two in Calcutta, and when I think of these days, when there are in the city of Bombay alone two or three daily papers, written with very considerable ability, in Guzeratti, and one or two in Mahratti, besides a perfect cloud of bi-weekly and weekly newspapers, I still feel that we have only got at the opinions of a small section of the natives who are able to read those newspapers, and who are able to write in them; that we are still as far as ever from learning what the great body of the people think and feel on the subjects that concern them; and that we are as far almost as we were before from the means of reaching them or instructing them through the Press. I have not time to describe many other means by which public opinion is reached in India, though they are all of them of more or less value. There are the planters and public officers who are dispersed through the country; there are the missionaries, who, in some way, learn more than any other class; and there are the public servants all over the country, whose business it is to know something about the feelings of the people over whom they rule; but, notwithstanding all this, there remains the fact that, with regard to the great masses of the people, the Government of India does know, and can know, but very imperfectly what the people wish and think and feel.

I will now very briefly sketch out a plan by which I think it is quite possible that we may arrive more nearly at something that is

needed as a means of ascertaining the public opinion of the great body of the people in India, and I will then leave what I have to say on the subject for consideration and discussion by other gentlemen; merely saying that if they can suggest any better means than those which I would venture to lay before them, I would be the first to hail the suggestion.

I would first of all ask you to begin with me at the beginning, as it were, of Indian social organisation, and to consider what may be called the unit of Indian administration—viz., the Indian village, which, as you all know, is a very much more compact and defined body than what we know as a village in this country. As anybody who reads Sir Henry Maine's work or any other work on the subject may learn, the Indian village embodies something much more perfect and more thoroughly organised than those parishes to which Mr. Goschen so wisely wishes to bring us back in this country. And let us note, with regard to the whole of this subject, that in so large a country as India, with so many diversities of race, and of social condition and political organisation, no uniform plan can possibly answer for the whole country, and we must be content, as far as one can, to attain a uniform end by very diversified means. And, secondly, let us bear in mind that we should not wait till we have discovered such means in every province; it will be a great gain if we can hit on the means of ascertaining the real public opinion of the mass of the population in only a few tens of the two hundred millions of people in India. Do not let us be deterred by difficulties in one province, if we can learn what we want to know in another. And, thirdly, let us bear in mind that in any given province imperfect means are better than none at all. If we can only learn the real public opinion of a single class—say of the chiefs or superior landholders or the city traders—it will be a great gain, even if we find it difficult to get at the opinions of the bulk of the common people. Now let us apply those principles to the consideration of the subject with regard to one portion of India. I give you these suggestions merely as relating to the portion with which I am best acquainted; but I may say in passing that I know of very little difficulty which could be experienced in applying a similar plan to other parts of India; but, for the reasons which I have just given you, I would ask you not to throw the suggestions aside because you do not find any one system applicable to the whole of India.

Now let us consider the village councils, which exist almost everywhere in their ancient form, and in somewhat of their ancient power. In many respects, as I said before, they may be regarded as the equivalents of such assemblies as our forefathers used to have in their

parishes, and I trust that no feelings regarding the shortcomings of select vestries will induce you to think lightly of the efficiency of the Indian village council. Those councils exist now, and exist in some considerable vigour, and I believe it would be only necessary to recognise them and give them a status in our administrative machinery. They might consist, as they do at present, of the head-man, of the village artificers, of the village officers, of the rent-free and tax-free holders of land, and all holders of land whose names are separately entered as separate proprietors in the books of the village. I would let them meet as at present whenever the head-man called them together, either of his own accord or at the instance of the district officer. It is of great importance not to attempt to introduce too much of form or system among them, and I do not know that any formal record of their proceedings should be required, except when they had a presentment to make; in such case it might be signed by the head-man or notary on behalf of the village, and be sent up in the form of a memorandum or petition to the district officer, in whatever might be the recognised form of addressing the superior to whom it should be transmitted. Once a-year there should be a more formal meeting, and a record of the proceedings, in which they should be required to report briefly the state and requirements (if any) of the village public works and institutions, appending accounts of the moneys at their disposal, and nominating those who should represent the village in the district council whenever it might be called together. This is the most essential feature of their constitution, that they should be an elective body, which should send up representatives to a district council. I would not attempt too strict a definition of the subjects or extent of their powers. In almost all villages there are roads to be cleared, travellers' rest-sheds and sometimes village-walls and other public buildings to be repaired, schools and police to be maintained, all of which have to be paid for in money or labour by the village. A yearly discussion and presentment on these subjects might revive the interest which the village officials and communities have always taken in them, but which there seems reason to fear may be crushed out under the multiplicity of circulars and scattered reports, and of perpetual external meddling, which it is the tendency of our system of departmental centralisation to foster. As regards the authority under which the village council should be constituted and act, there is none more potent in the eyes of the natives themselves than the immemorial usage which can be pleaded for that as well as almost every other village institution. The difficulty is to connect such an institution with our legal and official system without crushing or paralysing it by the rigid formalities into which it is the

tendency of our principles to become fossilised. Where there is a periodical settlement of the land revenue, I would make the constitution and powers of the village council a necessary and essential part of the settling officers' proceedings, and I would prescribe by law that he should leave on record a list of those who were privileged to have a voice in the council, specifying the documents they should be required to send in at their annual meetings. I have little doubt but that when the significance of this document is understood, the right to be named in it will be valued much in the same light as the possession of a field or other title to village status. It should be subject to whatever revision and authorisation the law may prescribe for the final proceedings of the settlement officer.

As I said before, the chief significance of such a village council—in respect to ascertaining public opinion—would be that it would form the body to select representatives to state the opinions of their fellow villagers in the district councils. Those district councils would correspond as regards relative area and population to our county meetings here. Each village might send up one or two delegates, who would ordinarily be the head-man and notary public, but there should be nothing to prevent a village from sending any other representatives they might prefer. The very large villages, and towns under the size of a large city, might be empowered to send more than two representatives, in fixed proportion of so many representatives to so many thousand inhabitants. In addition to these village representatives, all the smaller rent-free holders possessing one or more villages (the inamdars and jageerdars) should have seats of right. The ordinary meetings should be annual, with special summonses for special purposes. They should be presided over by the district native officer, who should see that their proceedings were recorded, and a copy forwarded to superior authority. To this body I would entrust unreservedly the management of all district funds for roads, schools, and police, and I would consult them on all matters affecting or relating to the district. I do not mean that I would put the initiative or the control of everything entirely in their hands, but I would ponder well their advice, and hear their comments on every measure affecting them, and, above all, on every proposed re-settlement of the land, or revision of other items of revenue. I believe those would be functions which would give the district councils a very considerable amount of employment, and they would be functions which might be exercised with the greatest possible benefit to the Government. They would also elect members to serve in the provincial councils.

Similar in position to the district councils would be the larger municipalities, exclusive of cities of the first-class, whose municipalities

would rank with provincial councils. Such legal authorisation as might be required for the proceedings of these district councils might be given in the Acts of Legislature relating to land settlements.

We now come to the provincial organisation. The provincial councils might consist of one or more representatives from each district council, and from each great city municipality not included in a district; all chiefs and larger jageerdars; all collectors, and magistrates, and political agents; and selected officers from the public works, educational, railway, and canal departments. They should be summoned annually, or oftener if necessary, and should be presided over by a revenue or political officer of the highest grade, such as the revenue commissioners in Bombay, or a member of the revenue board, or a selected commissioner of revenue in other parts of India. In apportioning the areas which such provincial councils should represent, geographical, or ethnological, or linguistic, and also fiscal considerations, would have to be taken into account. Your provincial council should as nearly as possible represent men of like speech, and of pretty uniform circumstances as regards their geographical position. For example, I would say in the Western Presidency you might have five. You would require one for Scinde, one for Guzerat, one for the Canarese-speaking districts of the Southern Mahratta Country, and two for the Mahratta-speaking districts (one for the table land above the Ghauts, and the other for the coast districts and Bombay). All of these, with the exception of the last two, would represent a population speaking a distinct language; and when I remind you that each council would represent a population of from three to five millions of people, I do not think you will say that the area chosen is unreasonably small. These provincial councils I would consult unreservedly regarding the apportionment of all Imperial funds allotted to the province, and I would adopt no great measure affecting the masses of the people until it had been thoroughly discussed in these assemblies. To them I would also entrust the selection of a limited number of representatives to be summoned to the local legislative council, where their functions would be like those of the other members, not merely consultative or suggestive, but legislative. It is not necessary that I should for the present go beyond these provincial councils, because anything further relates to legislative matters, regarding which a very effectual commencement has been already made.

I have now asked you to consider—(1) the village organisation, (2) the county organisation, and (3) the provincial organisation. The provincial organisation is the one which at this present moment I consider the most important of all, because, as you are aware, a policy of what is called decentralisation has been adopted by the Government of

India, after very full experience of the unworkable nature of the centralised policy which we had previously attempted to carry out; and the policy which is now adopted must, I feel convinced, depend for its success on the power of making use of such authority as the Government of India may choose to delegate to the Local Governments, and the power of making use of that authority in a manner consonant to the wishes of the great masses of the people. I believe that the policy which has been lately inaugurated has in it, if it is carried out to its full extent, and to the full meaning of those who have adopted it and introduced it, the seeds of the greatest possible benefit to India, and that it may enable us to do what we might otherwise find to be a very difficult task—to hold under contentment a population which it would be utterly impossible to govern through the medium of any such centralised policy as we have attempted to carry out during the past ten or twenty years, by a system of departmental organisation. That organisation cuts straight through all the natural organisation of villages, districts, and every other division which has arisen naturally, and has grown with the growth of the people, and has lasted for so many centuries. But while I would not discuss at any length any possible extensions of the Local Legislative Councils, I will merely say, in passing, that if, let us say, for example, two elected members from each provincial division—making, say, in Western India, ten in all—were sent up to the Local Legislative Council, I feel confident that they would in every way greatly strengthen the Council, and give additional weight to all its legislative proceedings. This, of course, would require an Act of Parliament; all the other measures which I have mentioned might be carried out by the Government of India and by the Local Governments, merely as matters of internal regulation and order, though, of course, it would be very desirable, and necessary ultimately, to give legislative sanction—such sanction as can be given in India—to the measure.

I will now ask you to spare me a very few minutes while I anticipate a few of the objections which seem to me to lie upon the surface, and which may be, and I am pretty confident would be, started to such a scheme as I have proposed. First of all it would be said, "This is the representative government with which we are finding fault in every part of our colonies." I have not time to describe, and you, I dare say, have not patience to listen to any description of the process by which representative government, which in our childhood was looked on as one of the most excellent features of our English Constitution, has come to be a by-word, as applied to the colonies; but I will merely remind you of this fact, that what is called representative government too frequently means simply putting into the hands of the multitude the

means of governing the property which they do not possess, and the intelligence which they themselves ought to possess, but of which they do not always give evidence in their proceedings; and that representative government which represents merely numbers, and gives no adequate representation of property and intelligence, is not in any true sense of the word representative government at all. But this description in no way applies to such councils as I have ventured to propose; they would be in a very high degree truly representative, and as such would possess a value which I am old-fashioned enough to think belongs to all really representative institutions.

Then there is another objection which would be sure to be taken by most Englishmen, and that is, that "any system of the kind would be contrary to the genius of the natives of India;" but I do not think that is an objection which would be taken by anybody who really knows the customs and understands the genius of the natives of India, because he would see that the system is in reality nothing more than a development of the old Indian system of open durbars and open cutcherry. If you went into any native state and asked what were the characteristics of any good government that they may have had among themselves, they would always tell you that "it was a system of open durbar," in which the ruler sat and gave the opportunity for the expression of public opinion, to which all petitioners had more or less access; and in like manner, if you asked any native who were the best European rulers he ever knew, he would tell you, among other characteristics of anybody he would name, that he was a man who would always sit regularly as his time allowed "in open cutcherry;" that is to say, he sat where he could be seen, and where he could see and hear the people over whom he ruled. Anybody who has watched the working of native society will see that its genius is one of representation—not, I will admit, representation by election under Reform Acts, but representation generally by castes, and trades, and professions, every class of the community being represented; and that where there is any difficulty, anything to be laid before the Government, anything to be discussed among themselves—a fellow-citizen to be punished, or a fellow-citizen to be rewarded—there is always a public meeting of the caste, the village, or the district; and this is an expression, it seems to me, of the genius of the people as unmistakable as that which is arrived at by our Saxon method of gathering together in assemblies of different kinds, to vote by tribes, or by hundreds, or by shires.

Then it will be said that "a despotic government has no need of consulting public opinion, and India must be governed despotically by personal individual authority." Now to this proposition I beg to enter

my most emphatic protest. Time will not allow us to discuss whether Cæsarism is a good system or a bad system, but, be it good or bad, it is the Cæsar, the true despot, who most requires to know public opinion; he is powerful only so far as he comprehends it. I would only ask you, as time does not allow an argument on this subject, to run over in your minds all the modern despots of whom you may have known something, or of whom you may have heard something. Take a man like Runjeet Sing. I ask any one who has served in the Punjaub what the state of things in the Punjaub would have been if Runjeet Sing had not been the most able feeler of the pulse of his people in the Punjaub, the best acquainted with the public opinion of his people? Take Dost Mahomed. Did not Dost Mahomed in his own person and in his own mind represent most clearly and powerfully the best features of the Affghan mind? Take, again, Mehemet Ali, a man who built up a despotism for himself, who ruled in peace and in war with distinguished success, and who left a kingdom to his successor—what was the secret of his success as a despot? Simply that by the intuition of genius he understood the public opinion of the people with whom he had to deal, and took very good care to consult those who best knew the feelings of every class about him. Whether it was the Fellahs, or the Copts, or the Armenians, or the Greeks, or any foreigners, he always took care to have about him people who could tell him what was the public opinion of every class in his dominions. And, to pass over all others, I would ask you, what was the secret of the success of the most able Cæsars we have known in modern days, the late Emperor of Russia or the ex-Emperor of the French? Was it not that, whatever were the merits or demerits of their government, they knew their people, and they knew their feelings accurately? In the more recent of these two cases especially we can see that Cæsar succeeded as long as he did understand correctly public opinion, and he failed when he had not the means of ascertaining it. Those are only a few instances, but I beg you to think over the subject, and to reflect whether it is not the true despot, the personal ruler, who needs more than others to know accurately the public opinion of the people over whom he rules. And if this be the case with such great men as those I have named, how much more necessary must such knowledge be to men who are at least inferior to them in being strangers and foreigners in the lands over which they are called to rule!

Then it will be said: "Such councils as you propose to have would degenerate into mere debating societies, and you will never get the real opinions of the natives." To this also I would beg, from my own experience, to enter my most emphatic contradiction. I have seen both

in Calcutta and in Bombay the very feeble tentative measures which we have already tried there in the shape of councils, in which a few natives sit for legislative purposes, and I can state that, whether we got little or much of the real opinions of the gentlemen who were my colleagues in those assemblies, we always got very much more than we should have known in any other way; and, as far as I was associated with them, I can testify that at no time of my life, at no period of my official connection with India, did I get more valuable information as to the real wants and feelings of the people than I got from my colleagues who sat with me in the councils of India in Bombay.

Then it may be said that "councils of this kind may fail from having no real authority." Now, I would beg you to observe that every one of them will have the power of advising regarding the expenditure of very considerable sums of money—the expenditure of everything connected with roads, schools, police, and so on; they will have the power of advising, and that is a power which, as you know, in this country even, with our own rather proud and touchy population, who are used to other modes of expressing their opinion, is not without its weight and value. You will find that the presentments of your grand juries, the presentments of your magistrates in sessions, and the resolutions of public meetings, in this country, abounding as it does in other and weightier means of expressing public opinion, are never without their weight; and something very much more will be the weight attributed to the presentments of such councils as I have attempted to describe. They would have the power of advising regarding the expenditure of very considerable sums of money in various ways, and, I believe, they would have ample means of employment to preserve them from rusting or from throwing up their duties in disgust at having nothing to do; and when, as it must happen occasionally, you have to consult them with regard to the imposition of new taxes, they will feel then that they have a real potential voice in the government of their fellow-men. What other good may result incidentally from the power they will have of stating their grievances and saying what they feel, and what would be the value of such incidental results, I need not tell any gentleman here present who knows practically how fond the native of India, as the native of every other country, is of being heard, and of having the power to state his grievance.

Now, I feel that I have trespassed too long upon your time. I have attempted very briefly and imperfectly to shadow forth a scheme of organisation which, I trust, may be elaborated so as to assist in what I consider to be one of the greatest fiscal reforms which has ever been attempted in India—viz., the step towards what is called the decentralisation of the finances of India—but which I should rather call the perfect

centralisation through local government—which has been already taken by the present Viceroy ; and I trust that the subject—which, imperfectly as I have attempted to deal with it, is one of the greatest importance—may be discussed by other gentlemen, and thought over, and with some benefit to that India for the good government of which we are all so anxious.

CHAIRMAN.—As there is still some time left, if any Member feels inclined to offer any observations, perhaps he will kindly favour us with them.

Mr. WILLIAM TAYLER.—Sir and Gentlemen : I need hardly say that I most cordially concur in the sentiment expressed by Sir Bartle Frere, that this subject is one of the most important that can be offered to the consideration of those who have any regard for, or take any interest in, the administration of India. Before I offer the very few remarks that time will allow me to make, I will say one word on a point which, though of very little real importance, may, if misapprehended, lead to confusion. I refer to the definition of "public opinion" with which Sir Bartle Frere favoured us. I cannot quite agree in that definition. In asking the question, "Is there public opinion in India?" and then answering it by saying, "Are not the people of India the same in character and constitution and nature as other people?" I do not think that the right point has been exactly hit, because I do not think that when we talk of "public opinion" we mean the opinion which remains in the breasts of people unexpressed; but when we say there is "public opinion" in England, and not "public opinion" in India, nobody for a moment supposes that the people of India do not think, and think very deeply, and feel very deeply, upon all matters that concern them—we merely mean that there is *no expression of opinion.* "Public opinion," in common parlance, I do not think means the opinion of the public, but opinion which is *publicly expressed,* and, taking it to be so, we come to the very root of the matter—viz, that the people of India have really *no representation whatever!* However deeply they may think, however deeply they may feel, there is no conceivable organisation or means by which that opinion can be laid before the authorities. This is perhaps a very nice and narrow philological distinction, but it may be of some use to bear it in mind when we are considering the subject in all its bearings. Passing over this trifling matter, I would only observe, as time is very short, that the state of India in respect to administration is unhappily this: where we naturally look for sympathy there is antipathy; where we look for co-operation there is antagonism; where we might fairly expect trust and confidence there is suspicion and distrust. This is a most formidable and perilous condition for any country

to be in, and, looking round me and watching the opinions and the actions of Government and the authorities, whether in India or in England, I see no hope, as matters stand at present, of this miserable state of things being rectified except by some such means as those now suggested by Sir Bartle Frere. If we take a slight retrospect of our Indian administration, and look at the relationship which has hitherto existed between England and India, it has been very much like that between a kind but rather rough and careless parent, and an unruly, sharp, but somewhat ricketty boy. The father cuffs the boy on the head, gives him his orders, stuffs him with whatever he thinks wholesome, whether suited to his constitution or not, and carries out a rough paternal despotism, without dreaming of opposition or cavil; but the boy, somehow or other, picks up scraps of information, and all of a sudden the father finds that the lubberly and obedient boy has grown into an educated, thinking young man. That passive submission to the father's will which led the boy to obey his father's orders without questioning has passed away; the boy has learned to think, and with thought he has learned to criticise his father's actions and scrutinise his commands. That is the position now of India. For a hundred years we have dealt with India as we would with a submissive and unquestioning child. We have knocked the people about, we have given them our orders and prescribed their action, we have substituted Perigord pie and truffles in the place of the rice and split peas to which their rude stomachs were accustomed; we have given them laws unsuited to their habits, we have graciously presented them with a burdensome and crushing taxation, and we have never thought it worth while to ask the opinion of one single member of the native community, except those three or four honourable, high-minded, and bejewelled rajahs who have of late years been seated as aristocratic dummies in the Council! What is the consequence? We are at a deadlock. We find now that when we impose a tax there is, as Mr. Grant Duff dramatically says, a "shriek" resounding from one end of the country to the other. I did not, until this evening, exactly know whether it was quite consistent with Parliamentary etiquette to refer to evidence given before a Committee of the House of Commons while the Committee was still sitting; and as I have rather an exceptional horror in regard to that mysterious crime called "contempt of court," I had hitherto refrained from any allusion to the Committee now engaged in its important inquiries; but, as Sir Bartle Frere has set me the example, I cannot refrain from saying that I was exceedingly amused (I will not use a harsher term) at reading the evidence of two ex-governors of Bengal in relation to the salt-tax. Without the slightest hesitation or

anything to suggest the idea that they were not fully acquainted with the innermost recesses of the natives' hearts, what they said almost amounted to this, that the poorer natives were perfectly satisfied, nay, that they rather *liked* the salt-tax than otherwise! They certainly said, with the utmost confidence, each confirming the other, that they had never heard the natives complain of the salt-tax, and, as it is an old tax, that they really are perfectly satisfied, and, indeed, prepared, if necessary, to give a little more than they did before. No doubt these opinions were conscientiously uttered; but it is a fact, almost amounting to absurdity, that English gentlemen in high position, who never in their lives, perhaps, had spoken to one of these poor unfortunate natives, who, out of a miserable pittance of twenty shillings a-year, are now called upon to pay a considerable amount in taxation for one of the necessaries of life—that gentlemen who have never taken the slightest pains to organise the means of ascertaining their feelings, should say (as they would of a half starved Bengalee bullock, which makes no complaint, though he has carried the yoke until his shoulders are raw) that because they have paid this tax without complaint out of their miserable pittance, that, therefore, they are perfectly contented with it. I can only say, it may be true that the people are so used to that tax, so accustomed to be galled and screwed, that they accept it as a necessary evil; but for a gentleman in high position in England to venture before a committee of the House of Commons, to say that he knows the feelings of 150,000,000 of people regarding a tax affecting their miserable subsistence, and that they are contented with that tax, is a palpable absurdity, which only shows how blind he is to the real position of the country. And this brings me to another grave and important question. Looking at the present state of things, looking at that large body of natives whom we have generously and wisely educated, and who are on a par as regards intellect with Englishmen, we must see that we must henceforth not only organise some appropriate means of ascertaining the feelings and opinions of the country, but we *must* be prepared to give to those natives whom we ourselves have educated and prepared for the task, a fair and fitting share in the administration of the country. For the accomplishment of the first appeal, the scheme which Sir Bartle Frere has proposed appears to me to be one containing *elements* of the most perfect success. It would be utterly impossible for any one who does not know all the different classes of Indian society to say that any particular scheme would be *entirely successful*. We must be at first contented with a gradual organisation; we must devise and carry out some machinery by which, as suggested by Sir Bartle Frere, we really can, before we enter upon any new taxation or measure

affecting the interests of millions of people, ascertain what are the feelings, what are even the *weaknesses*, of those people for whom we are legislating. I do not enter now upon that consideration. I confess I have very great apprehensions in regard to the feasibility of carrying out that suggested organisation in practice. I do not say the difficulties are insuperable, but I believe the effect of our rule during the last century has been this, that a spirit of submission and subserviency, I may say almost of toadyism, has so pervaded the whole race of the people, and we are now so universally regarded as despots, that the real difficulty of working a system of county, provincial, and village consultation will be the difficulty of persuading any single native that we invite *his honest and independent opinion.* We have already seen something of these tentative councils. A gentleman is now present who, in a most amusing book, "The Chronicles of Budgepore," has told us what sort of councils those are where the collector, or magistrate, or judge, chooses three or four respectable, but very remarkable, flunkies, just to attend upon his council and to echo his words, and the difficulty is enhanced by the fact that in the present day the English officials—who, after all, would have to organise and carry out the system—are not the men who are acquainted with the natives, nor men who would be likely to encourage any familiar or kindly intercourse with them. It may be an ungracious prediction, but I fear this will be a difficulty. But, whatever may be the difficulty apprehended, it is our duty to make the attempt, and I have no doubt whatever, that, unless that attempt is very soon made, the result will be not only great disaster, but terrible peril to the Government. We see the Government now at a dead-lock. We see every single measure that is brought forward criticised, and criticised most ably, not by the English Press only, but by the Native Press and the native community. I can safely say I do not think there are ten men in India or England who can bring forward so acute and so searching an analysis of our position and of our measures as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, our honorary secretary, whose absence we now so much lament; and when we see that such intellect has now been brought forward by our own education, when we see the large body of honourable, aspiring, and intellectual young men prepared for action by the education which we have placed within their reach, we must feel that the time has arrived when we must deliver over a certain share of the government into the hands of those instruments which we have thus fitted for the task. That, I think, will be the eventual result of the scheme now proposed by Sir Bartle Frere. We shall have healthy public opinion, from the cottage to the council, if we can but induce the natives generally to give us their independent sentiment.

Then, and then only, shall we safely legislate for the country; then only shall we establish a link in the chain of sympathy, from the lowest peasant up to the highest official in the country.

Mr. FOGGO.—I should like to be allowed to say one word. It is to express a hope that the observations of Sir Bartle Frere may take some practical shape, and may lead to some practical result, and that they may have some effect in bringing about a change in that high-handed mode of levying both imperial and municipal taxation which has prevailed during the last few years in India. It may be said that such a system as Sir Bartle Frere has marked out is contrary to the genius of the people of India; but I am quite sure that it would be much more contrary to their genius or to the genius of any people to be called on from time to time to pay such taxes as feast-taxes or marriage-taxes, without being consulted as to their wishes regarding them.

CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps Mr. Erskine will favour the meeting with a few observations.

Mr. ERSKINE.—I should have been very happy to do so, and I dare say I may be able to do so on some future occasion, if I have the opportunity; but at present, as regards the more practical suggestions which Sir Bartle Frere has made, I do not think I could enter upon them with the hope of adhering very strictly to the point, because I am not quite certain that I understand the nature of his proposals in regard to these councils. If his address is to be printed, as one of his addresses on a former occasion was, and if we have the opportunity of discussing the matter again, I think very likely I should avail myself of the opportunity of saying a few words. There is another reason which leads me to think that I might, perhaps, with more satisfaction to myself, say a few words later, and that is that I see here a good many of our Indian fellow-subjects, and it appears to me that this is especially a question on which we should follow the example of Sir Donald Macleod and other administrators, in hearing, in the first instance, what is to be said by our native friends themselves, with the hope of learning something from them, instead of laying down our own opinions too strongly.

CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps it will be consonant with the desire of the meeting that we should postpone the discussion to a future day.

Mr. TAYLER.—In the course of next month I am to read a paper very much to the same effect, though, perhaps, going a little beyond it—a paper on the possibility of admitting the natives into the councils of India. We might, perhaps, then discuss the whole question together.

Mr. KAZI SHAHABUDIN.—The discussion on Sir Bartle Frere's address would quite take up the time of one meeting, I think.

Mr. HARRYCHUND CHINTAMON.—The subject which has been treated

by Sir Bartle Frere in so masterly a manner is a subject of so much importance, that unless the native members had first the opportunity of seeing Sir Bartle Frere's paper in print, I do not think they would be able properly to deal with the points he raises.

On the motion of the Chairman, seconded by Mr. Kazi Shahabudin, it was resolved that the discussion be adjourned till Sir Bartle Frere's address shall have been printed and circulated amongst the members.

CHAIRMAN.—It only remains for me to congratulate the meeting on the highly instructive address which we have heard from Sir Bartle Frere this evening. I am sure we are under the greatest obligation to him for having initiated a discussion on so important and interesting a subject—doubly and trebly so when we remember the position which he holds as a member of the Council of India, and. therefore, himself in a position in some measure to carry out the views he has so ably expressed. I am sure it is most encouraging in many ways to the East India Association that a man like Sir Bartle Frere, holding the position that he does, should come forward to discuss questions of this nature. It must tend very much to elevate the character of this society in this country. I consider that the East India Association, though now in its infancy, is eminently calculated to assist in that which Sir Bartle Frere suggests the means of doing in his address—viz., enabling the natives of India to make known their real sentiments in this country. It is gratifying to find that an able administrator like Sir Donald Macleod should, as the result of his experience, think it necessary to consult the natives of India, especially in the Punjaub, amongst whom he has so long ruled, successfully, before he ventures to initiate any new measure of taxation. I think that one fact speaks volumes for the success of our endeavours to raise the natives of India up to our own standard. It shows that there does exist among them a public opinion, to which we find it necessary to pay some sort of submission. I now call upon you to vote your cordial thanks to Sir Bartle Frere for the able and interesting address which he has given.

Colonel FRENCH having seconded the motion, it was passed unanimously.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Chairman.

A vote of thanks was passed to the Society of Arts for the use of their rooms.

MEETING AT THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1871,

For the Adjourned Discussion on the Address read by Sir Bartle Frere, G.C.S.I., K.C.B., on "The Means of Ascertaining Public Opinion in India."

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR VINCENT EYRE, K.C.S.I.,
IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, which at that period were but thinly attended, remarked that the members attended under rather disadvantageous circumstances, the notice summoning the meeting having been rather short—a fact which, no doubt, in a great degree accounted for the limited attendance. Besides this it was a "Government night" in the House of Commons, and it no doubt prevented many members of Parliament from attending the meeting. Still, it was possible that some might come at a later period of the evening; but as the subject was of far too great importance to be passed over hurriedly, he would take the sense of the meeting whether the debate should be adjourned to a period when there would be a chance of a larger gathering.

Colonel KENNEDY.—I cannot allow this meeting to separate without expressing the cordial feeling which I share with Sir Bartle Frere on this important subject. It is a topic of the utmost interest to all concerned in the affairs of India, and to me, who have given the subject considerable thought for fifty years of my life, it would be a great pity if the matter were debated and settled by so small a meeting as has gathered here to-night. The best possible time should be chosen, and exertions made to gather a large meeting, so that all interested in the proper Government of India may attend when Sir Bartle Frere's suggestions are discussed.

Colonel FRENCH said he should second the motion for adjournment, because many Members of Parliament would attend if the House of Commons were not sitting; and it would be a pity if the subject did not receive the fullest discussion.

Mr. PRICHARD.—But if we adjourn the subject now it may happen that we shall never have an opportunity to discuss it, for we are already late in the session, and a short adjournment would not be likely to bring more members. The question may well be left entirely to the judgment of Sir Bartle Frere; if he desires to carry on the discussion now, let us proceed, but if he thinks it would be better to adjourn, let us postpone for a time the further consideration of the subject he has brought before

us. Personally, I confess I am in favour of carrying on the meeting, for at the conclusion we can still adjourn, and be no worse off than before.

The CHAIRMAN said the majority of those present were evidently unwilling to adjourn without a debate, and probably more members would arrive as the hour advanced. Besides, as Mr. Prichard remarked, there would be nothing to prevent the debate from another adjournment.

Sir BARTLE FRERE said he was quite in the hands of the meeting, and was willing either to proceed or to postpone the discussion, according to the convenience of the members. He was afraid that they could not take the limited attendance as a sign of acquiescence in the suggestions he had made. It was one of those subjects which could not be too fully discussed, though he quite agreed with Mr. Pritchard in the remark that there was danger that in postponing the debate it might probably never take place at all. Enough were certainly present to greatly aid in the solution of the question; and there were many in the hall who were able to give a very valuable opinion upon the subject. Perhaps the better course would, therefore, be, to hear what those present had to say, and then to postpone the further consideration of the subject to a more convenient season.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the adjourned debate, said: The Secretary has placed in my hands a paper which he seems to think will interest the meeting, as bearing immediately upon the subject we are met to discuss, and with your permission I will read it:—

"Sir William Muir, speaking on the subject of the Local Rates (North-West Provinces) Bill, in the Legislative Council assembled at Government House, Allahabad, April 6, 1871, made the following remarks: 'I submit to your Excellency's consideration that, for the satisfactory working of the decentralisation scheme, a local financial council would be most useful. And why, my lord, should there not be a local legislative council also? We have all the elements for it here. Besides official members, there are many independent native gentlemen well fitted to aid in such a council. It is true that, compared with the presidency towns, the non-official European element is small; but even from these, worthy representatives might no doubt be found. Such a local council would, I submit, be better fitted than the Imperial Legislature for discussing and settling local measures like this Bill—chowkeedaree arrangements, municipal measures, and such like matters. With a local council such measures would be discussed in committee, would be debated in open council; the measures and the reasons for them would become locally known, would be taken up by the native as well as the European press, and would thus become familiar to the community. In short, they would acquire what, I submit, they have not now, a popular

aspect. My lord, it is my constant, my earnest endeavour and desire to lead the people to administer their own affairs. In all my circuits it is one of the first things I seek to impress upon the municipal committees, that self-government is one grand object of our municipal institutions. And they are beginning to respond. I am convinced that no measure would tend more directly to foster this spirit of independent action than a well-selected legislative council, with representative men *seen* and *felt* to be debating on questions affecting their own people. And who, my lord, would be better qualified for effective local legislation? Wants and wishes, and, it may be, prejudices, all bearing upon local legislation, are, surely, best known to the inhabitants of the province. Here, also, would be best known the capacities and requirements of the Administration; as the crew of a ship best know what their own vessel can perform—when to loosen this cord, when to tighten that; when to crowd sail, and when to take it in—so the local council would be best qualified to watch the progress and course of the local administration, and to shape their measures accordingly. I know, my lord, that the proposal is not one at present in favour, but my conviction is that the constitution of such a council is simply a question of time, and I feel that I merely discharge a duty to the provinces over which I am placed by your Excellency in submitting thus openly my opinion, in the hope that such expression of my views may lead to the earlier consummation of a measure so much to be desired.' His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General remarked, with reference to this suggestion: 'I will only add one word more, and that is to express my great satisfaction at the opinions enunciated by the Lieutenant-Governor in regard to local committees; that is to say, with regard to the assistance they may receive from the natives of the country as to the management of their affairs. I had the satisfaction of mentioning the other day how the Lieutenant-Governor of a neighbouring province had pushed on that good work. I believe the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West has done no less than Sir Donald McLeod in this respect, and I believe that no man can devote his time or his labour to a work that will be so certain to effect a more immediate result than the development of those institutions which have always, and in every country, formed the germ of good government.'"

I think nothing could be more *apropos* to the question we have in hand, or more encouraging to those who share Sir Bartle Frere's opinions in the scheme which he so ably and lucidly put before us at the last meeting. In fact, Sir Bartle Frere's proposition seems to have been, in a measure, anticipated by Sir William Muir in the speech I have just quoted; and it forms a very good basis on which to commence our evening's discussion. I hope some of our native friends whom I see present will

not be backward in favouring us with their views on this important subject.

Mr. FORSYTH.—I have just been counting the persons at present in the room, and I find we have about the number which constitutes a "House" in another place, and therefore I think we ought not to postpone the discussion. You know that in the House to which I allude, if forty members can be got together to discuss so very insignificant a subject as any matter which affects the interests of India, it is considered that a great deal has been done. The forty men "in another place" differ from the forty gathered here to-night in one important particular; for it is not too much to say that every man here, in debating the affairs of India, knows what he is talking about, and has sound experience to support his opinions. I am sure I shall be borne out by the native gentlemen present, when I say that to our fellow-subjects in India there is probably no subject which more warmly engages the feelings and sympathies of their hearts than the one which has been introduced by Sir Bartle Frere—viz., the calling in of the native opinion to assist in governing the country. Perhaps it would be more satisfactory to the meeting if I confined my remarks to that part of the country in which I have laboured the best years of my life—the Punjab—which, as you know, acquired the character of being possessed of as much "go" as any part of India. The subject now before the Association has been one very much spoken of by the chiefs of the Punjab; and a paper was put forward long ago setting forth their claims. In respect to Sir Bartle Frere's paper, I observe that in meeting the first question which would naturally be asked in considering his scheme, "Is there such a thing as public opinion in India at all?" he put before us the formidable dictum of the Duke of Wellington, whose opinions are very difficult to gainsay. But fortunately the Duke did not command in the Punjab, and I have therefore less diffidence in declaring, on behalf of the natives of that province, that a strong and distinct public opinion does exist. Numberless instances could be given in support of this statement. In 1869, when Mr. Wilson passed through the North-West Provinces to inquire into the best means of raising money to meet the liabilities of the Government, his avowed object was to ascertain whether a licence-tax could be imposed on the population. He passed up to Lahore and down again, and though only in the Punjab less than a month, in the course of that time he succeeded in acquiring an excellent estimate of what the genuine opinion of the whole people was in respect to indirect taxation. This was not the result of elaborate despatches, or of long leading articles, or of the "coaching" up by the clever "leaders of public opinion," as they are called in

England, but it was the strong expression of a general wish on the part of the people. I can speak from experience, for I was a Commissioner at the time, and I know how the natives came forward to express their common conviction. There could not be a stronger proof of the existence of public opinion than that. A year or two afterwards this system of indirect taxation was considered not to be quite what ought to be in operation. And so the licence-tax was imposed; and in this we called in public opinion to help us in a very efficient way. The people were collected, and they were asked how they thought the taxation could best be imposed. The result was that the licence-tax was imposed on the people by general consent, and I don't think the percentage of injustice or inequality of distribution was anything which could be considered appreciable; and wherever it was discovered it was at once redressed by the simple expression of feeling by the people themselves. Here, then, is another instance where a strong public opinion helped the Government in a most critical part of the administration—the collection of taxes. Many public officers have taken some trouble for years past to fairly weigh this question, and I know that great objections may be raised to a realisation of such a scheme as is now put before us. There are men who are strongly opposed to it, and it is well to think out their objections. In this light there was great advantage in adjourning the debate on Sir Bartle Frere's address, for it afforded us the opportunity of consulting the opinions of other people. Since Sir Bartle Frere's address was given, I have conversed with several old Indians on this topic, and the first objection they make is, "Why can't you let things alone?" And they urge that things went on very well before these new opinions came into vogue. This remark has a good old Tory ring about it, but the answer to it is that things cannot be as they used to be in India, because India is now no more the India which existed before the mutiny than the London of the present day is the London of the time of Charles the First. Things have completely changed. In the first place, we all know that in the old times it was a very common thing for the officer in charge of a district to be a sort of patriarch, who patted the people on the back, went through their little villages, heard their tales of sorrow or wrong, and helped them where he could. But those happy days—and those of us who know what they were will agree with me in calling them happy days—are, I am sorry to say, now rapidly passing away. I shall not be suspected of intentionally throwing any slight upon the progress and law reform which, no doubt, were greatly needed in India; but, with the utmost admiration for all this, I cannot blind my eyes to the fact that officials now are not able to do what their predecessors did. Officials now have no time to enter into the feelings of the people, and

inquire into their prejudices. They are not allowed to go out of the established beaten roads; they cannot go about as they used to do; and they are tied to a mass of routine desk work; so that it is impossible to get at the feeling of the natives in the same way as it used to be accomplished. An instance in point occurred to me as I was passing through India a short time since. I arrived at a locality where there was a man who had a grievance in that the Government had given him some land ten years ago, but he had been unable to obtain possession of it yet. He was asked why he did not go and state his complaint to the collector of the distict. His reply was, "Oh, it's no use; he will only tell me to write what I have to say on stamped paper." This indicated a state of things common all over India, so that the argument of those who ask, "Why can't you let things be as they were?" falls, necessarily, to the ground. Besides, it should be recollected that in former times the people were not educated as they are now in course of being. I agree in thinking we ought not to take any special credit to ourselves for this; for if we did not give them education it would be a shame upon us. But if we teach the people what are their rights, and give them the opportunity of acquiring knowledge, we must expect them to ask for a share in the government of the country; just as the child whom we teach to talk and run about naturally proceeds to the exercise of its acquirements. There is, therefore, nothing surprising in the fact that the people of India come forward to ask for some voice in the administration of the affairs of their country; it is, indeed, a natural result of the course we have pursued. The next objection—and this is one that is always strongly insisted upon—is that the natives will not express their real opinions, or if they do the opinions will not be worth having. What is the course now pursued? When any important measure is about to be introduced by the Government, the head of the provinces—the local governor—calls upon the chief subordinate officers to express their opinions; and they, in their turn, are worth nothing if they do not get together the opinions of the best natives around them. But, even where the officers consult native opinion, I am afraid, in nine cases out of ten, the names of the natives who give the advice are always forgotten. Herein lies a sore grievance among the natives, who say, "We are never heard of, and no notice is taken of what we think." As regards the free expression of opinion, I think there are those present who will bear me out in saying that the natives shrink from doing so, because the fact is they get rather "snubbed" if they express an opinion contrary to that held by the official questioner. "I have often been asked my opinion," says a native, "but I do not give it, because if it was not approved I should be told to walk out of the house." This is too true in many instances;

and this is one of the reasons why we do not get a fair and trustworthy native opinion. I could give you plenty of amusing instances of this, but time will not permit. I think, however, we may safely arrive at the following conclusions: First, that there is a native opinion; second, that it is worth having; and third, that in the present state of things we cannot do as the officials of former days were accustomed to do, by reason of the great progress in reform in every way in India. And, therefore, the question remaining to be considered is, how shall we get the genuine native opinion? Sir Bartle Frere has put forward the idea of village and provincial councils; and it is a proposition which commends itself to all who give it due consideration. The desire of the natives for something of the kind is general throughout the country. If you will allow me I will quote to you the opinions of the natives of the Punjab most distinguished for intelligence and good judgment, as well as for thorough loyalty. One man says: "A council is absolutely required, as in the Supreme Council of India. Native interests, especially of this province, are not sufficiently represented. The opinion of the people is unknown, and the Government is, to a great extent, unacquainted with their desires." Another says: "There is no other way of informing the people of what Government wants, or the Government what the people want, than by a Council. Newspapers and the fact that the Government call occasionally for the views of natives are very useful in their way, but they afford the people neither a sufficient means for expressing their opinion, nor a sufficient guarantee that such opinions will be listened to." Another says: "Laws are sometimes regarded with distrust, simply because the people have not been consulted. The Government is, no doubt, very wise in all it does, but the fact remains that it is a stranger to many of the feelings and wants of the people." Another says: "Hitherto the people have refrained from expressing their real opinions, which results in ignorance of their wants and suspicion of the Government." Another says: "A council would be of the greatest advantage in identifying the interests of the rulers and the ruled. Laws would then not be passed without obtaining first the consent of the people, and this would render their execution easy." Another says: "It is necessary to establish such a body, as laws are now introduced on which the opinion of the people is not asked. If this were done, laws would be in accordance with the wants and usages of the people; *e.g.*, an adultress used in Sikh times to be punished, but is not now, under English rule." Another says: "The Legislative Council cannot possibly know the feeling of the whole of India. This province wants a council, for acts are now passed which are adverse to the interests of this province, but to which it is necessary to submit.

What other means can there be for knowing what the people want? No law can be popular that does not receive the consent of the people. Such a council will be a source of strength to the Government, for it will only be too ready to give assent, once knowing that it is backed by the people." Another says: "Why are the Government acts and notifications not translated and widely circulated among the people whom they concern? At present the natives are in the dark regarding the spirit and the policy of the British laws and Government." Another man of a cynical turn of mind says: "Why should the Government fetter its own action by asking the opinion of the people? It can do now as it likes, and will ever continue to do so. On the contrary, it is much better not to ask or inquire, for inquiry can only show that the people are unable to pay, for instance, certain taxes, which, however, Government consider it necessary to levy. If the public policy of this country is to be based on argument, then an argument which may be considered as conclusive by the Government may not be considered equally so by the people. This would be merely creating additional difficulty in the way of carrying out measures. Of course, theoretical government, based on the principle that it is instituted to attend to the welfare of the subjects, will only too gladly listen to their opinions; but as government is, after all, only composed of public individuals, it is certain that they, with very few exceptions, will tolerate no interference. The British Government, however, has a desire to govern only for the benefit of the people; but it is neither respectful nor safe to offer opinions contrary to that of any of its Thakims—*i.e.*, rulers. It is not wise to show the people a means for expressing their views, because they may become unanimous in wanting something which is really bad (? according to British ideas)." You will observe that the main difficulty is that "the natives are in the dark regarding the spirit and policy of the British laws and Government," and this is a point on which Sir Donald McLeod has given very valuable testimony. It is his decided opinion that "the suspicion entertained by the natives regarding the actions of the Government arises simply from ignorance." The native opinions I have quoted were given four years ago, and since then the Government has taken a very important step in what is called decentralising the finances of the administration, and this has resulted in transferring the administration of a certain portion of public affairs from the Governor-General with a Council, to the Lieutenant-Governors without a Council. This change has, therefore, made the introduction of native opinion, or of some consultative body, absolutely necessary. I don't know whether it is intended that we should go into the practical part of the question, and settle what form it would be most advisable that the native councils should take. On this point I would advise

that the natives themselves be first heard. But as regards the general scheme sketched out by Sir Bartle Frere in a manner so clear and concise as to be at once understood, I can only express my hearty and entire concurrence in all that he—an eminent servant of the Government, a well-known friend of the native population, and now holding a high office in England—has suggested. I venture with diffidence to express an opinion contrary to his in regard to a minor point. Speaking of the provincial councils, he says: "They should be summoned annually, or oftener, if necessary, and should be presided over by a revenue or political officer of the highest grade." I hope Sir Bartle Frere will excuse me for putting my experience against his, but in speaking my opinion I know I only express the feelings of the people of the Punjab. They say, "If we are to have native councils let us have no Europeans in them. We cannot give an independent opinion if there is an Englishman anywhere near us." Sir Bartle Frere will bear me out in saying that if he were to pass throughout the country with a view of collecting opinions respecting a particular policy which he purposed carrying out, he would find that all through India natives would come and express opinions favourable to his scheme. But he would be quite aware that these opinions did not necessarily express the genuine native feeling; too often it is quite contrary. The fact is the natives will not express their opinion in the presence of Englishmen as a general rule; and to get their true sentiments they must be altogether left alone. A hundred proofs of this will occur to the mind of everyone who knows anything of India. With this one slight exception, I beg to subscribe my hearty concurrence in the scheme proposed by Sir Bartle Frere.

Mr. HARRYCHUND CHINTAMON.—Sir and Gentlemen: The first impression that a native of India has on his arrival in England is, that he finds himself placed in another part of the world, different in climate, manners, habits, state of living, and social feelings. The English mind, he finds, is brought up to a great state of development, and the knowledge acquired of a variety of things is utilised in manifold ways for the well-being of the people and the prosperity of the nation. Here is freedom from rank or caste. The mind thus being morally and intellectually instructed, it has become invigorated to such an extent that England has been raised to a great independence of thought and solidity of character, and the public opinion has become the ruling power of the nation. So much is this the case that the governing bodies derive the truth or shape the course of government in accordance with the feelings and wants of the people, and not by their own inadequate and imperfect thoughts; for they know well that human beings are

liable to frailties, and however correct knowledge they may have on several subjects, and however extensive their information may be, yet these are of little avail in the balance against the whole weight of the experience and knowledge of an intelligent people. And, therefore, public opinion in England is considered not only true and correct, but experience has proved that it is both agreeable and safe. Now, let us see whether India has the same advantage. I would say, No; for though India was once the seat of great learning and wealth, she has been deprived of both, and is at the mercy of the British Government, who, considering her a sacred trust under Providence, feel here that they are morally bound to impart the same privileges to India in general. England gratefully acknowledges the benefit derived from the immense wealth and riches of intellect of India, and she, in return, feels bound to say that the English Government has not been wanting in giving free education to her children, and in the endeavour to effect good to the people at large. But this only has not been sufficient, a great deal remains to be done. The generality of the governing bodies or of the executive functionaries in India are, if I mistake not, neither so liberal, nor social, nor animated by such true Christian feelings. Their attitude is such that they make the people feel their position of subordination, and their feelings and opinions are treated with indifference. Very seldom is the right of independent expression of opinion granted to them. Though the authorities here in England have done their best to communicate their feelings, and have sent orders to do every possible good and treat the people of India fairly, so as to give them their equal rights irrespective of creed, colour, or caste, yet what has been done? Only very few offices of emolument have yet been granted, I may as well say, to blot out the tears of the people of India. Under these circumstances, how is it possible for the people of India to express their true feelings openly and independently? Dare they attempt, they are ridiculed, and sometimes treated shamefully by their superiors, and are very often warned to mark the difference between the governors and the governed. I would further say that the natives of India in general are treated as condemned creatures, and not worthy of being attended to. The sources of information regarding India which England possesses are, I believe, two—the public press and the Government officials. The former give expression to a limited experience, and what they know within their precincts. The thousands in the interior —cultivators and others—remain quite unrepresented in their several grievances. Besides, the press have not the means of ascertaining their feelings. The second source of information—Government officials—as a body, are not at present so willing as Sir Bartle Frere showed himself to

be, to mix with the people of India, to know their inner life and grievances. Consequently they are only able to represent one side of the picture. The two sources of information—the press and officials—are very imperfect, and would never tend to civilise any nation. The suggestions now thrown out by Sir Bartle Frere are not only the best, but if the Government can be prevailed upon to practically carry them out, and not allow them to remain as dead letters, as has hitherto been the case, no doubt the results would be highly satisfactory and congenial to the ideas of the people of India. In addition to Sir Bartle Frere's proposal, I think it would be highly advantageous if the Government were to appoint a native and a European, having at least a true interest in the welfare of India, to travel through the interior and study the feelings of the different peoples of the country, their habits, their condition. This information, collected on the spot, would be much more valuable and correct than any which could be culled from the formal reports of an official; because few even of the native dwellers in the large towns of India have any true insight into the condition and sufferings of the poor cultivators of the soil in the interior; and unless they are mixed with and familiarised with, their habits can never be properly studied. The advantage of combining a native with a European in this Commission is obvious, for the former would be able best to secure the confidence of the people, while each would facilitate the other's work in various ways. Two men travelling into the interior of each province in the manner I suggest would learn more of the inner life of the poorer people than ever was known before, even by the most experienced. The dwellers in the larger towns are in a far better position than the cultivators of the soil, for if they fail to prosper in their trades, and fall into distress, their wants are known and are relieved. But with the poor ryot the case is altogether different. They are seldom taken any notice of, their feelings and prejudices are never consulted, and it is to these the Government should direct their attention. In the little travel I have had, I have seen with my own eyes in the interior the large majority of the poor people sunk in cruel misery—misery so deep that death is looked upon, not as a scourge, but as a relief. Without hope, without encouragement, oppressed and ill-treated, they have not the solace which men of education would have were they to fall in a like condition, and for the same reasons they are rendered incapable of assisting or encouraging each other. Several objections which are likely to be raised to the scheme of native councils have, in my opinion, been sufficiently answered by Sir Bartle Frere in his address, so that nothing more is necessary on those points. In the representative system in the Legislative Councils, which has lately been tried, the selection of members has been generally confined to rank and wealth,

but not intelligence; nor have men of any literary standing and extensive information, as to the real state of the country or the sections of its people, been called upon to represent their views. The natives of India are very desirous and anxious to state their grievances and ask redress, if only opportunity is offered to them, by giving them their due share in the administration of the government of their country; and the time has now come when this should be done. India, at present, is in a state of helplessness, and has become poor in wealth; and in this, her depressed and disabled state, she appeals to English feelings of humanity, as to a younger sister, for help and succour to ameliorate her condition. India has long been in a state of submission and dependency, and has quietly submitted to all sorts of suffering and irregularities. And now England, after having given a sound education, with a good Christian heart, to the children of India, they look for their elevation in position and for the opportunity of giving free, though charitable, expression to their feelings. The Government, on the plea of financial difficulties, propose new taxes, which of late have been so much increased, and have become so burdensome, that the people of India are not only distressed, but impoverished to such an extent that they can only look to England to preserve them from their wretchedness and misery. And if at this critical moment the authorities should not consult the feelings of the people, and their state and condition, before levying new taxes, they will fail in doing their duty, and they must remember that there is a certain limit to forbearance and submission. In conclusion, I would say one word more: As English statesmen gave expression on public occasions to their feelings by saying that they hold India as a sacred trust under Providence, I most humbly and respectfully urge that the eye of Providence is closely watching England's actions in respect to the feelings and opinions of the people of India. If England discharges her duties as under the eye of Providence, she will merit the reward of the Most High—the One and True Living Father of us all, differing though we do in external appearance. Providence has been pleased to bless England with wealth and intelligence, and if she were not to take mere glory in her triumph, but tried to do her best to elevate the position of India, she would be fulfilling a sacred duty towards her neighbour. As the Christian proverb says, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

Mr. PRICHARD.—I think it was fortunate, Sir, that it was determined to postpone the further consideration of Sir Bartle Frere's very interesting and instructive paper to the present occasion, because the scheme suggested by him appeared at first so very startling that I felt, and I believed others have shared that feeling, we should like to think it

over before we expressed an opinion on the subject. The interval has allowed time for reflection, and I have, after consideration, come to two conclusions, which I will, if you will allow me, briefly state to the meeting. I fear the plan suggested will hardly be successful. The Indian races have been for so many years ground down under the crushing weight of arbitrary and despotic rule that they require a long course of political training to educate them up to that standard of independence of thought that will induce them to believe that they can express their opinions freely upon public questions with impunity. I am sorry to say that I cannot think our present system of administration is calculated, as a general rule, to impart that education of which I speak. I think that if more encouragement were given to induce the natives to express their opinion on public questions, we might in time give them that independence which would enable them to speak out without hindrance. At present I do not think it will be found that this will be the case. I think the measure by which Sir Bartle Frere endeavoured to provide against that suppression of opinion, by providing that under certain circumstances the councils of which he spoke should be presided over by native officials, instead of Europeans, would hardly have the desired effect. I think all who have been in India will agree with me; and Sir Bartle Frere himself will admit that in nine cases out of ten, when the English official asks a native subordinate a question upon a matter of public interest, the answer is given in the way the native supposes will be most likely to accord with the opinion of the questioner. We hear a great deal occasionally about the overbearing conduct of English officials to natives, and we have heard the subject alluded to by the gentleman who has just spoken. This may be sometimes, and I fear it too often is a true bill; but as far as my experience goes, the native in power is ten times—aye, beyond all comparison—more impatient of free expression of opinion than the English official. And the reason is not far to seek. The English official carries with him from his country sentiments and associations derived from his long residence under a free constitution, and to him there is nothing new or foreign in the idea of freedom in expression of opinion by individuals. On the other hand, to the native of India, and of all Oriental countries, the free and unfettered expression of public opinion is something altogether strange and foreign. It is totally new to him, and I repeat that until the natives have been educated up to a higher standard of independence of thought, Sir Bartle Frere's scheme will, I fear, prove ineffectual. The second conclusion at which I have arrived is, that Sir Bartle Frere has too much overlooked the fact that the legitimate channel—shall I say the only and legitimate channel?—of public opinion is the press. I daresay what I am

going to assert will appear absurd and paradoxical to some who hear me, but I assert it with a full conviction of its truth, that the Indian press, by which I mean the native as well as the Anglo-Indian press, is as good a representative of public opinion as the press of England or France. The press of India is free from one great disadvantage which characterises the press in England, France, and some other European countries. In this country a public question is discussed not so much upon its intrinsic merits, as upon considerations, not exactly of party questions, but of personal influence under the guise of party questions. Thus, for instance, the Prime Minister and his colleagues may be angels of intelligence and wisdom, they may propound the soundest public measures, measures that are wise, good, and just; but no matter, the Opposition journals will hold them up to ridicule, and stigmatise their measures as unsound, impolitic, and foolish. On the other hand, members of the Opposition may bring forward measures equally good, politic, and beneficial. But the Ministerial organs will condemn them simply because they proceed from the Opposition, and, perhaps, stigmatise the authors of them as idiots and political charlatans. This is the weak point of the English press, and it is a serious one, but it is one from which the Indian press is entirely free. English people call this system party government, and defend it as being constitutional, and they like it because it suits the active and vigorous political spirit of the country, and I daresay it is all right. But, on general grounds, it must be obviously an advantage to have a press less under the influence of party feeling, and accustomed to weigh and discuss, to approve or condemn, public measures purely on their own merits, and not according as a man stands in favour or disfavour with the editor of a party journal. In the Indian press measures are discussed in this impartial spirit; the writers sift every question as well as they can, and consider it in all its bearings. It may be that in some respects the Indian press is not so well informed as it might be, but yet on the whole it does, I think, beyond question, fairly reflect public opinion as far as we are likely to get at it. The only other remark I would make is, that if we would wish the natives of India to express their opinion freely on political and public questions, some encouragement must be given them to do so. If we would have them tell us what they really think and feel on matters that concern their own interest, we must encourage them to do so by means far other than those which have been used hitherto. The sort of encouragement they do meet with may be seen from the way in which the remonstrance against the income-tax was received in the House of Commons the other day—the House of Commons, recollect—that assembly where of all places in the world one would expect that a temperate and

respectful remonstrance against an obnoxious impost would have been received, at any rate, with courtesy and attention. Yet how was that remonstrance received, Sir? A minister of the Crown—a member of a so-called Liberal Government—could stand up in the House and stigmatise the temperate protest of an oppressed people as the shrieking and howling of discontented serfs This is the kind of encouragement the public opinion of India meets with in the House of Commons! Do you think, Sir, those words have not gone over the length and breadth of the land, and sunk deep into the hearts of a hundred millions of people? I am sure I express the feeling of the meeting when I say that we heard Sir Bartle Frere's address with the utmost possible interest, as a valuable suggestion for the solution of a difficult problem in our Indian administration. But for myself, I cannot help thinking that Sir Bartle Frere would have done a still greater service to the cause if he had devoted his acute intellect and his best experience to the solution of the problem, not "how best to ascertain public opinion in India," but how best to induce the Indian Government to attend to it when it has been ascertained.

Mr. Syed Mahmood.—I should have been reluctant to speak on the subject before the Association this evening, but since I find, Sir, that it is your desire to hear the opinions of those natives of India who are present, I feel it almost a duty to say what I think about the subject upon which Sir Bartle Frere has addressed you. Respecting public opinion in India, I perfectly agree with those who consider it a matter of great importance; and I share the opinion of Mr. Prichard in regard to the English press in India. That press, doubtless, endeavours to obtain accurate information respecting the opinions of the people, and gives its views respecting questions which affect public interest; but it expresses the views only of the European community. I doubt the great importance attached by the last speaker to the native press, and my remark will appear less surprising when we take into consideration the reluctance of the native editors to publish any opinion against the Government. They are afraid to do so; and I am sorry to say that, in some instances, the influence of the Government has been used in putting down the opinions of native journals. Under such circumstances it is easy to see that the difficulties which beset the investigation of native opinion are by no means small. The natives always feel that the editors of the native journals are personally responsible for what they write less to law than to the English officials, and thus opinions in any way against the Government are almost always left unexpressed. Mr. Prichard has alluded to the topic of the attitude of English officials in India. I will not enter into the disagreeable dis-

cussion as to whether it is the fault of the officials or the fault of the natives, but I may express my conviction that the evil arises from faults on both sides; and it must always exist so long as we do not understand England and the English character, and do not appreciate the British sentiment of liberty. It is true, as a speaker has said, that a few of the natives of India are capable of understanding the system of English Government in India, but by far the majority of the natives are quite incapable of doing so, and have no means of knowing the difference between the Government of India now and what it was a century ago; for though no despotism rules India, yet the English officials are regarded as possessing all the powers which the aamils under the Mogul Emperors used to have. Under such circumstances the difficulty of finding out the real opinion of the natives is extraordinarily augmented, but still I do not think it is beyond the power of the British Government to find out means to ascertain the public opinion of individuals. I can allow that we are too far back in civilisation to have a sufficiently good and sound public opinion upon which the Government can base its legislation; in fact, it would be dangerous to yield to it more than its value deserves. In saying this I do not mean to be in the least unpatriotic to my country, but I express convictions which must be held by all unbiassed and impartial men. But although we are not yet capable of entering largely upon the arena of public affairs, I am nevertheless convinced that the public opinion of our masses is of great importance to the British Government—indeed, of the most vital importance. I do not mean by this to assert that the public opinion of the whole body of the natives is correct upon public questions; but I do assert that, right or wrong, public opinion should be watched by the Government, and its sentiments carefully weighed. Neglect in giving the necessary attention even to a grossly erroneous public opinion may have the most injurious effect. The enormities of 1857 were committed because the natives did not know what good the British Government had done to their country, and they were equally incapable of understanding what would follow after the expulsion of the British nation from India. The mutiny, perhaps, would never have happened if we only had a better knowledge of the system and objects of the British Government. And could no means arrest the excesses of '57? Without entering into the painful inquiry as to what, on the one hand, was done by the natives of India in 1857, or, on the other hand, what was done by the English in suppressing the rebellion, I may express my regret to find that the larger number of the Europeans who were then in India seemed inclined to lay the whole blame upon the poor native population, forgetting that the admission involves the admission that the British Government of

that time were in the most extraordinary ignorance of the current of public opinion in the great provinces over which the English rule extends. No admission, however, is made that all the wrong was on the side of the natives; and, perhaps, the best we can do is to let the mutiny pass into oblivion. But justice must still award that there were faults on both sides, and that the Government had erred in neglecting to study the public opinion of the people. The native population yield willingly to the influence of the Government, but when we know that the Government is really neglecting a means of information which would be alike beneficial to the population and the Government, a hearing should be granted; and means should be given to the natives of seeing that the British are really ruling the nation for its own benefit, and of seeing whether the revenue of India is devoted to its welfare, and not sent to swell the riches of England. If the native desire to have some share in public affairs is not gratified, it is not a matter of much wonder that dissatisfaction exists, and the people become in critical times capable of doing things which they may afterwards regret. Now, Sir, we all agree that there is much difficulty in ascertaining the public feeling of India, but the gentlemen who have spoken on this subject do not seem to have proposed anything which may render the Government capable of finding out the thoughts of the people. I have already said that I think it would be most dangerous for the British Government to attempt to manage India, solely guided by the public opinion of its people; but I repeat that even a study of our ignorance would be a wise thing on the part of our rulers. To take an instance, trifling in itself, perhaps, but important in its bearing—or so at least it appears to me—I mean the supposed danger to the British rule in India from a Russian invasion. Well, Sir, in this country it is said to be impossible for the Russians to cross the immense mountain barriers which must be passed to reach the plains of India, and that even if Russia attempted an invasion, it would be easy for the British Government to send a Sepoy army to the frontier to successfully stay the Russian advance. People who argue thus do not take into consideration the public opinion of India on this subject. In a city, once the capital of the Mogul Empire—I mean Delhi, to which I belong—I can tell you the public opinion held there by all classes, Hindoos and Mohammedans. You are aware that Delhi was considered to be the chief place from which, in the year 1857, the greatest mischief of the mutiny was done; and now, Sir, it is a city where political opinion strongly stirs the people, and so strongly does the supposed Russian invasion influence public opinion that it is believed that the day is not far when the sound of the Russian guns will be heard at Peshawur. It is also believed that if Russia crosses the frontier the whole of India

will rise in arms against the British rule, quite indifferent whether the change will be good or bad, but simply influenced by the desire to revenge the injuries of 1857. But no measures are taken by the Government to mitigate the evils which give rise to this impression, which, however ridiculous, may bring forth the most unhappy results. To look in another direction, the British Government may work great good while endeavouring to remedy the evils of which the natives complain, if they consult public opinion in respect to the acts of the Legislative Council. I am sorry to say I have met with people who have lived in India all their lives, and who might, therefore, have been expected to know a great deal of the government of the country, who would have England rule the nation altogether regardless of public opinion. These gentlemen forget that perhaps the only—certainly the best—justification for England's rule in India is that she desires to raise the people from their sunken condition, and to do the nation good in every way. And in undertaking this great mission England is bound to disregard her own private advantage, and to comfort, protect, and encourage her weaker sister, trusting to the gratitude which I hope the country will ever show. A gentleman has alluded to the income-tax in India. I was away from home when that tax was instituted, but from private correspondence, and from what I have gathered from my friends, I think I can estimate the public opinion of India on the subject. Of this I am quite sure; there is an almost unanimous opinion that the revenues of India are very ill-managed, and that the Finance Ministers are either very careless or incapable of managing or arranging the taxation of the country; and the natives think they could manage the finances of the country much better, if they were allowed to have any hand in the matter. Public opinion inclines to the belief that the revenues of India go to enrich the pockets of England; and though to us the impression appears ridiculous, yet to me it only shows the necessity for permitting the natives some association in the government of the country. They will then see how totally unfounded is the impression they hold. If I may be allowed to express my opinion as to the mode by which the British Government may be able to learn the true public opinion of India—and it is an opinion not held by me alone, but shared by others—it is to establish district councils by means of a voting suffrage. And though it would be neither wise, nor possible to extend the suffrage so widely as it exists in England, yet all possessing a certain amount of real propriety or its equivalent might have a vote upon such a question. If such councils were established, and presided over by the district officers, and if the ballot system of voting were adopted in the council, there would be little difficulty in getting at the real opinion of the

country on any given subject. It is actually the fact—though the people in England cannot understand it, never having seen it—that the officers of districts are very much dreaded by the people whom they govern, and, in some instances, I am sorry to say, the fear is not unfounded. If I were in the place of some of the landholders, I would, indeed, be very reluctant to be required to give my frank opinion on any question asked me by the district officer if my opinion was likely to displease him, and in doing this I would be guarding my interest. But by the ballot system the matter might be so arranged that the people who have to give their opinion could have no reason to fear the Government displeasure. I have already said that the opinion thus gathered from the provincial or district councils all over India would not necessarily be proper to follow, nor would the Government be bound to grant what was asked. The advice of the natives would probably be often not such as could be adopted; and this must always be the case until the nation are sufficiently well advanced to have trustworthy opinion, as in civilised European communities. While the Government would thus be secure from the adoption of unwise measures, it would be in a position to hear and know the feelings of the nation, and would, besides, be giving to the people that incentive to advancement which is the aim of good government. This end would be greatly assisted and obtained by a proper system of education in the vernaculars of the country, when an intelligence spreading among the masses of the people would give weight and value to public opinion, and to obtain this most desirable result should be the constant aim of the Government, not only for the benefit of India, but for the honour of the country by which it is ruled. Acting thus, the British Government will show that their rule is not a yoke upon India, but a blessing from Heaven.

Mr. TRELAWNEY SAUNDERS observed that, viewing the subject from a purely British point of view, he would venture to express his opinions upon it, and he did so as one who had some little experience as a participator in the government of a metropolitan parish. I doubt [continued the speaker] whether administration in an English point of view is understood to be designed for the purpose of bringing about, or directing, or aiding, political discussion at all. I do not think it is any part of the business of an administration to deal with such questions. They are incidents, not objects of its work. If we give the proper objects of an administration, upon just and proper principles—if we teach the Indian people (and in fact we have little to teach them in respect to the principles upon which local administration is based) to re-erect the institutions which existed from time immemorial among them, and desire them to carry on their local affairs as we carry on our own—the incidents of

political and social opinion will work themselves out of their own accord. I totally differ from Mr. Prichard in regarding the press of India as of influence on public opinion. I know that in saying tl is I am bringing upon myself the castigation of gentlemen who have the reputation of holding the tongue of public opinion; but I care little for that. I believe that anywhere and everywhere, if we want to find a just expression of the opinion of the public, we must look upon it as it is given in a publ'c meeting, properly organised and limited. Not such meetings as we are now prone to in this country—concourses of rabble in places where they are utterly unknown; but meetings of persons in localities where they reside, and are known as men of understanding. No expression of opinion given in any other form can be called public opinion legitimately; and no other expression of opinion is entitled to the weight which the phrase conveys. Now, in India our position may be regarded as one of transition. Hitherto our position in that country has been that of conquerors; and it is a comparatively easy thing to govern by the sword. It is quite true that we did not seek this position; we entered India as traders, and desired so to remain; and, being assaulted, we were obliged to oppose force to force, and thus came to our present position. We find ourselves in this position, that if we desire to remain as traders we must be rulers also; and the first consideration, therefore, of the British Government is, How to maintain our rule in India? This question now presents itself in a new phase. We cease to rule the country by merely military occupation, but have erected a civil administration. I am sure I share the sentiments of all true Englishmen when I say we should be exceedingly sorry to maintain a despotic administration in India any longer than was absolutely necessary to the peace of the country and the safety of the English, and therefore I am glad to support the proposition which is now under discussion. I held this opinion years ago, when it was the fashion to say that public opinion in India was a thing not to be regarded at all, that the natives would never be fit to govern themselves, and that the ideas of local self-government and representation were altogether foreign to them. Such was the opinion expressed by many gentlemen who returned from India. But all that is changed. We have learned that in India municipal institutions exist of a date far older than our own; and, that being the case, if we look at the actual administration of India, we can hardly fail to see that the danger we incur is that of over-governing India. We are taking much more upon ourselves in India than would be safe for us to adopt here; and if the Government of this country were to undertake the entire administration of all the affairs, local and general, of the people there would be a revolution, and it would be impossible at the same time to

encourage a spirit of freedom. The same spectacle is presented in India, and what the Government must do is to withdraw itself as much as possible from interference in local affairs, and to leave them almost entirely in the hands of the people. But the great point to secure in administration is a proper and effective system of "check." You have no business to trust any people to administer their own affairs without watching them. If you give the people of India authority to manage their own local affairs, and take care that they are attended to, you will have afforded them an organisation valuable both to you and to them, especially valuable to you as giving the necessary machinery for estimating public opinion; and you will at the same time have relieved yourselves of a large portion of the responsibility which is involved in the government of 200,000,000 of people.

Mr. S. B. THAKUR, remarking on the observations which had fallen from several speakers respecting the native organs of the press, said he agreed with Mr. Prichard in thinking the Indian press is as good a means of ascertaining public opinion as that in England; and to his mind the remarks of Mr. Saunders on this part of the subject were incorrect, nor could he agree with the statements which had been made respecting the alleged subserviency of editors to officials. On the contrary, in his experience at Bombay, and from what he knew in regard to Madras and Bengal, the editors of newspapers had no fear in expressing their opinion. Sir Bartle Frere had urged that it is the duty of the public servants to go over the districts and learn something of the wants and manners of the people whom they rule. This was quite true; and the plea that no time can be found for this, although valid in some instances, is often but a poor excuse; the real reason for the neglect being the habit of the functionary to look down upon the people, and to rule them with a high hand, treating their grievances with indifference. He cordially agreed with Sir Bartle Frere's scheme; and to the objection that were an English officer placed at the head of the provincial native councils the candid opinion of the members would not be forthcoming he demurred, by remarking that it was hardly probable that in a native council all of the members would be so wanting in public spirit as to suppress their opinions. To the objection that the political education of the people of India is not sufficiently advanced to enable them to appreciate such a system, he replied that though a fault exists in this respect, yet it once applied to England herself, for she must have made a beginning in representative government, or of the duties of delegates. In those times the more intelligent and advanced in the nation guided the people to a right conclusion, and the same could be done in India; and if it were done he did not despair but that India in process of time

would reach the point at which the English people had arrived. One of the speakers observed that a native in office is a greater despot than an Englishman; but the natives were not appointed to any of the high offices; and if in subordinate positions there were instances where native officials had abused their power, they were certainly far less numerous than the instances wherein English officials abused their powers. Respecting the remark of Mr. Saunders that the first object of the British was to maintain their rule under any circumstances, the speaker urged that that was not the ground on which the English could base their claim to the gratitude of the natives. England's best plea is that her rule is the most beneficial to India, and that, holding the country in trust, she rules it only until the time comes when the people show themselves able and willing to govern themselves.

On the motion of Colonel French, the debate was adjourned.

MEETING AT THE SOCIETY OF ARTS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 1871.

For the Second Adjourned Discussion on the Address read by Sir Bartle Frere, G.C.S.I., K.C.B., on "The Means of Ascertaining Public Opinion in India."

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR VINCENT EYRE, K.C.S.I., IN THE CHAIR.

Sir Vincent Eyre, K.C.S.I., occupied the chair as on the two previous occasions, and, in opening the proceedings, he observed that, in order to widen the discussion as much as possible, and to give as many as possible an opportunity of expressing their opinions on the important question before the meeting, each speaker would be requested to limit himself to about ten minutes, more or less.

Sir Mordaunt Wells.—I shall be very happy indeed, so far as the ten minutes will allow—rather a short space in which to discuss so important a question—to give expression to certain views which I entertain in reference to this important subject which has been introduced by Sir Bartle Frere. I cannot conceive that there could be a question of more importance, because, to my mind, if it means anything it involves a radical change in the system of government in India; it means that the Government of India is to be the expression of public opinion; it means representative government; and it means that the natives of India are to have a voice in the public affairs of their country. Looking at the matter in this broad view, and taking as a basis the statement made by Sir Bartle Frere, namely, that there is to be a village council, that representatives are to be sent from it to the district council, who, in turn, will

send members to the provincial council—to consider this proposition in a proper light the habits of the people and the extent of education must be carefully considered. Now it happens, unfortunately, that the great majority of the people are uneducated. In saying this, do not let it be supposed that I am disposed to ignore what has been done in the way of remedying this condition of affairs. On the contrary, no man is more alive than I am to the real and substantial progress which has been made among the natives who have had the advantage of a high-class education. But this is true only in a very limited degree, and in that limited degree it only applies to the population of the towns. Get away from these centres of society, and what do you find in the country at large? The utter absence of education. Yet it is to the population of the country we must look to form the representative institutions which constitute the base of the proposed system. In the annual administrative report of the North-West Provinces I find that the state of education is simply this: the entire number of pupils under instruction was 200,831. Reckoning the number of those who are of suitable age for instruction, there should be 5,106,719 learners in the schools, or twenty-five times the present number. Assuming half the above number to be boys, there ought to be 2,553,360 boys at school, instead of 189,292. The report shows that 92½ per cent. of the boy population are uneducated; and did time permit I could satisfy you as to this by referring to other reports which have been published, which show what is the real condition of things. Whilst I am most sincerely of opinion that the propositions of Sir Bartle Frere are such as should be entertained and seriously considered as a feasible means of ascertaining public opinion in India, and as an efficient system of machinery, whereby the Government could collect most valuable information, still I wish it to be clearly understood that we are dealing with an uneducated people. Take Bengal—in many respects a favoured selection—and taking its population at 40,000,000, yet in all the lower-class schools throughout Bengal there are not more than 170,000 boys in daily attendance *receiving education;* this number being, of course, exclusive of the comparatively few who are in attendance at the higher-class schools. Sir Bartle Frere's scheme proposes to nurse the existing native councils in the villages, and it is not difficult to estimate the amount of knowledge there would be displayed in such assemblies as these. It follows naturally that the whole thing would be entirely in the hands of the few educated people in these villages. In what may be called the "go-ahead" province of the Punjab, you have a kind of representative principle at work in relation to ninety-seven municipal bodies, subdivided into three classes, with graduated powers of expenditure. The committees of the first-class municipalities are em-

powered to spend their income on objects authorised by the Act without reference to superior authority. Those of the second and third class are more under the control of the commissioner and district officer. It appears from the administrative report that the committees are composed of official and non-official members; that the mode of appointment is, in some cases, elective, but generally the non-official members are selected by Government. Now, how do these committees work? The same report says of these municipal bodies that the most effective, most influential, intelligent, and independent members of these committees are the Government nominees. If you go into the matter further you will find that in the Bombay Presidency during the last year the Municipal Act was introduced into several towns, its operation was suspended in Tarapoor, in Tanna, and Shendornee, in Khandeish, on petitions of the inhabitants themselves. I am not aware of the existence of municipal institutions in Bengal, except in the town of Calcutta, and, perhaps, in one or two other towns. I will admit, however, for the purposes of argument, that the working of municipal institutions has been successful. In Umritsur the mode in which the public business was transacted was most satisfactory, and I believe the municipal bodies in the Punjab are a perfect success. Now comes the question—How are we, first of all, to ascertain what is the view entertained by the natives on this question?—because at present it is a complete blank. I see here many gentlemen of great experience in various parts of India, and yet I will venture to say that not one of them could explain the working of a village council in India or what it means. Yet it is this which is to be the foundation of the representative principle in India. I may say that I am quite in favour of the proposition of Sir Bartle Frere if it can be carried out; but let us first see the method by which it could be made practicable. We ought to have correct information as to the real action of these village councils, and also of the feeling of the leading natives on the question. I say this because, although I feel it is all very well for us to meet here, and attempt to discuss a large and important question like this, it is certain that, after all, we can come to no satisfactory conclusion without a more extensive knowledge of the working of the existing institutions and the feelings of the natives. I agree with every word that has been said in urging the importance of the question; it is one of the deepest interest to the natives of India. I freely admit that the natives are entitled to direct representation in the Indian councils, as proposed by Sir Bartle Frere. But you might have a majority of natives in the legislative councils according to Sir Bartle Frere's scheme. Would you be prepared to adopt the legislation which they might recommend? If so, you will, as a consequence, have yielded to that body, or to its majority, the power of

passing acts, or of taking such steps as may effect a change in the whole policy of the Government of India in reference to the mode in which important public questions have been, or may be, dealt with. Last year I travelled through Russia, and in the course of my journey I visited several large villages, and there I found a system of village councils, in which certain powers were exercised with respect to bridges, roads, and different local matters; and it is remarkable that the same principle suggested by Sir Bartle Frere in respect to representation in councils is already in existence in Russia. The village councils there have the power to send delegates to the provincial assembly. There is, however, this important difference, that the provincial assemblies of Russia have the power of *imposing* taxes. And it is a point for you to consider that if you have in India provincial councils like the assemblies of Russia, with the power of imposing taxes, the importance of the scheme now produced cannot be overrated. All who have been in India and mixed at all among the native population have seen that if the people are sensitive of one thing, it is in reference to their taxation—they have the greatest possible dislike to it. And here I may remark, as illustrating the point, that among the witnesses recently examined by the Committee of the House of Commons on Indian Finance was a native gentleman, who, in reply to questions respecting the cess in Bengal for educational purposes, said he was willing that education should be set aside altogether, and that consequently, moral and intellectual advancement should be altogether stopped, sooner than see such a tax levied. I have said that in so large a question it is of the highest importance—indeed, I think it is absolutely necessary that the feelings of the natives in respect to it should be consulted. It is true that it is but an act of justice that you should give the natives a voice in the expenditure of the taxation which is principally borne by them. Although there is a large body of native gentlemen, thoroughly educated and perfectly competent to take up an independent position in any legislative body, yet they would be associated with a large number who would be sent there by the uneducated mass of the people. And therefore I think the first thing we ought to do is to educate the people of India—giving them an education similar to that given to the lower classes in this country. The progress of that education should be carefully watched by means of certain officers who can collect information, and observe the influences brought to bear on the people. And having done that, at the end of whatever number of years may be necessary to properly effect it, a proposition similar to that of Sir Bartle Frere must come before the Government both at home and in India. I am prepared to accept the result of such a step; but I say that if at any time the natives of India are in such a position of intelle-

tual and moral culture as to be able to form a solid and reliable public opinion, that moment a due share of the government should be given to them. I repeat that I am prepared for all the consequences of this, although to the future of India it may mean the placing of perfect self-control into the hands of the 150,000,000 of people, and the relinquishment of power by the dominant foreign race. We must do what is right and just to the natives by giving them a sound education, and thus enable them to enter upon the exercise of a honest and deliberate public opinion, free from the dictation of officials, whether native or European; and you will have laid a sound basis on which to found a superstructure of self-government. With these limitations I heartily concur in Sir Bartle Frere's proposition, that the natives of India are entitled to representation just as in Australia, in New Zealand, in Canada, of none of whom would any man begrudge even greater independence if they desired it than they now possess. Once adopt the principle in India, and you must not expect to control the feelings of 150,000,000 of people, who will assuredly ask for their rights, and, in the strength of their intellectual power, will be in a position to demand them. However unpalatable this may be to some of us, we must be prepared to face it with a good heart, and to accept any result which shall follow from our endeavour to be just, honourable, and upright in our dealings with the people of India.

Dr. MOUAT.—Cordially concurring as I do in the leading principle which is the basis of Sir Bartle Frere's address, namely, that in the government of India you must mainly consult the feelings and opinions of the natives of that country, and that you must associate them in the great work of government, I also agree with Sir Mordaunt Wells in thinking it impossible to narrow the question to the simple issue on which Sir Bartle Frere has placed it, for it really opens up the whole subject of the government of the Indian Empire. I believe, also, that until the mass of the people are more extensively and better educated than they are at present, you can scarcely with safety entrust any of the powers of governing to the natives of India, or that public opinion, elicited by means suggested by Sir Bartle Frere, would be of any great value to you. I am strongly of opinion that the acts of the Government ought to be regulated by native opinion rather than by our own preconceived notions on the subject. To show you how thoroughly sound Sir Bartle Frere's views are on this subject, I can give you some of the results of my own experience as to the value of native counsel in matters of great public importance. In the early part of my career in India, when in charge of the Medical College of Calcutta, an institution which has been the means of bestowing a vast amount of moral and material

benefit upon the community, there arose a great agitation among the natives on a subject which has been the cause of similar outbreaks of feeling elsewhere in more advanced communities. It was with reference to the pursuit of practical anatomy, and that event to which I refer occurred during the administration of Lord Auckland, a ruler who has not received fair treatment at the hands of the historians of India, but who was not less active in promoting the welfare of the people under his charge than he was wise in the measures originated by his Government. When the agitation arose Lord Auckland sent for me and told me that a monster petition was about to be presented to them to prohibit the dissection of the human body, as being repugnant to the feelings and opposed to the religious prejudices of the people, and that a great public commotion was likely to arise on the subject. He said to me that this question must never come before him as Governor-General, and he added, "I give you full authority to discover the cause of the agitation of the people, and, if possible, to remove it." Anxious, of course, to secure that no detriment should be done to the college by a prohibition of the all-important study of anatomy, I consulted the chief magistrate and other leading Europeans, members of the community; but no information which they could give me helped me in the least as to the cause of the popular commotion. I then went to an esteemed old native friend of mine, the late Ram Comal Sen, a member of the Council of Education, and uncle, I believe, of Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, the great Hindoo reformer, who has recently been among you. I stated the facts to him, and said, "You are one of the parents and founders of the medical college, and I ask you to help to rescue us from this difficulty, for if the pursuit of anatomy is to be prohibited it will be fatal to the progress of the institution and to the study and practice of medicine." He took the matter up with his customary cordiality and skill, and by his aid we traced the source of the popular prejudice to an interference with a very curious vested right which was interfered with. The matter was settled to the satisfaction of all concerned, the agitation ceased, and from that hour to this there has been no hindrance to the pursuit of anatomy in the college at Calcutta. It has extended throughout all the provinces of India, other colleges have followed in the wake of the noble institution in Calcutta, and medical science in India has been enabled to make that great progress which would have been impossible but for the assistance of an enlightened native gentleman in respect to a popular outcry. In this I think you have an apt illustration of the soundness of Sir Bartle Frere's argument; for it was this educated, honest, intelligent, and well-disposed native who rescued us from a dilemma from which, in all probability, we could not have extricated ourselves. I will give you an-

other instance which occurs to me, and it is in reference to the subject of vaccination, which is one of great and pressing importance in England at the present moment. Smallpox had become epidemic in Bengal, and was ravaging the provinces. An intention was expressed of legislating upon the means of stamping out the disease by means of vaccination in the place of inoculation, as practised in the country, which was rightly regarded as the chief and most mischievous agent in the extension of the disease. To this there was considerable opposition, and it was represented as being directly opposed, not only to native feeling and opinion, but to the direct religious injunctions of its shastres. The question was referred to me, as many similar questions were in those days, and I at once consulted the Pundits of Calcutta, Nuddea, and Benares, as to the religious bearings of the matter. Those learned men gave nearly concurrent testimony on the subject; upon perceiving which I referred the whole to my tried and valued friend Pundit Eshman Chundra Bidgasagur, a man who would be illustrious in any country in which great learning, united to lofty patriotism and purity of life, were valued. It was clearly shown that there was nothing in vaccination opposed to the religious tenets or national feelings of the Hindoos, and that, if the requisite agency and material could be found, its compulsory introduction would not be resisted. The consequence is that vaccination has extended very largely in the country, the old hereditary inoculators are now generally employed as vaccinators, and a large amount of benefit has been afforded to the people, in a direction in which popular ignorance and mischievous agitation have still to be overcome in England. There can be no doubt, then, I hope, of the justice of Sir Bartle Frere's inference, that the success of the government of Munro, the Elphinstones, and many other men of great reputation in India, was due to their wise and just practice of consulting the feelings of the people respecting their prejudices and opinions. To introduce such a system generally in the ruling of India, it appears to me to be absolutely necessary, in the first place, for the English ruling class to acquire the confidence and affection of the natives of the country, to associate freely with them on equal terms, and thus to make personal friends of them. Who can doubt the result of such a course as this? Early in my career in India I became acquainted with a quiet, unobtrusive, imperfectly educated, thoroughly honest, large-hearted Englishman, whose very name has probably never been heard in this room. The late David Hare was a humble watchmaker, who devoted the whole of his spare time, all the money he made, and untiring energy after business hours, to the education and welfare of the natives of Calcutta. He visited them in their own homes, he gave them friendly and fatherly advice whenever it was needed, and he gained so

thoroughly their confidence and affection that thousands followed him to the grave, which, by his own desire, was placed within the precincts of the first great college in India—the late Hindoo College of Calcutta—an institution which owed much of its high character and prosperity to his benevolent exertions. A statue was raised to his honour, and to this day the anniversary of his death is marked by the grateful natives, who meet together to commemorate his virtues and to express reverence for his memory. It was greatly by this good man's personal influence, in its infancy, that the progress made in education has led to the establishment of universities in India, and to the extension of the university system throughout that great empire. Sir Mordaunt Wells appears to think that the state of general education in India is so low as to render the adoption of Sir Bartle Frere's principle of representation in village and district councils of doubtful use at present. As regards the great body of the people, he is, I think, right, for, in statistics which I collected carefully of more than a million of the criminal population, I found that ninety-three per cent. were entirely uninstructed, a majority of the remainder could only read and write, and but three per cent. were fairly educated for their position in life. If time permitted, I believe I could show you that these numbers are probably a correct indication of the state of the population generally in regard to instruction. But of the class of educated natives it is impossible to speak in the same terms, for they are well qualified in every respect to take a much larger and more important share in the government of their country than is at present accorded to them. Take, for example, as typical examples, the native judges now sitting on the bench of the High Court of Calcutta, and it would be difficult anywhere to find more learned, upright, and able administrators of the highest judicial powers. Take, again, the native bar throughout the country, of whom the best members would do honour even to Westminster Hall, as an eminent chief justice has told us. To go a step lower, have we not a singularly efficient body of educated natives holding the chief executive offices in the revenue and judicial administration of the country? I do not hesitate to state my opinion that, but for the ability, integrity, industry, and great local and general knowledge of the excellent body referred to, the whole judicial and revenue administration of the country would collapse utterly. It would be idle to doubt that those who fill so efficiently the lower offices would not discharge with equal zeal and success the duties of the highest offices of those departments. With respect to the details of the scheme proposed by Sir Bartle Frere, I do not feel qualified to express any very decided opinion until I hear what the natives themselves say to it, for they alone are competent to determine the question. In dealing with so

ancient a society and civilisation as those of India, it is, however, right in all circumstances to build upon existing foundations, and to avoid all violent changes and disruptions. But, beyond and above all, if India is to be ruled from this country, as seems to be the prevailing feeling of statesmen, a feeling of which I take leave to doubt the prudence and propriety, it is absolutely necessary that England should rise to a knowledge of the fact that the government of the vast Eastern Empire has been entrusted by Providence to Great Britain for a higher principle than to grow cotton for Lancashire, to send jute to Leeds and Bradford, to form a training-school for warriors and administrators, or to enable enterprising merchants and planters to realise fortunes from her rich and teeming soil. The object is, I hope, to raise the people in the scale of nations, to educate and civilise the masses, as well as to afford the means of instruction to the higher classes, to provide a career for the gentlemen, noblemen, and princes of the country, to whom a fitting share in controlling the destiny of the land is at present denied; by more just and prudent laws to render justice accessible to all, and to afford due protection to life and property; to let the cultivator enjoy his lot in peace and plenty; and to raise the revenues necessary for the purposes of imperial and local government in such ways as shall interfere least with the comfort and happiness of the people. In fact, gradually and surely to educate the people of India in the great and abiding work of self-government, until, in the fulness of time, England may gracefully retire with the consciousness that she has discharged her duty righteously, faithfully, and without misgiving as to the future welfare of the country, from which she will part as a prudent and loving mother leaves her children when they go forth to fight the great battle of life for themselves. The saying (which has been quoted by Sir Bartle Frere) of that incarnation of common sense, the great Duke of Wellington, is as true now as it was when he uttered it. I am quite sure that so long as they are not rack-rented or oppressed either by Government or by their own landlords, and so long as they are permitted to enjoy the fruits of the earth in peace, there is no people with whom I am acquainted who are so thoroughly philosophical and indifferent as to the exact form of government under which they live. I speak from a personal acquaintance of the greatest and most important province of India, extending over a period of thirty years, in which time I have repeatedly visited every portion of it. I trust sincerely that the discussion of the matter, so ably advocated by Sir Bartle Frere, will eventually lead to important practical results, in extending the employment of natives of India in the government of that country in the only way in which it can be well and properly governed—viz., by acting in conformity

with the wishes, feelings, and, to some extent, the ancient customs of the people.

Mr. KAZI SHAHABUDIN.—There is a slight misconception in what Sir Mordaunt Wells said respecting the evidence of a native before the Select Committee of the House of Commons. I am the only native yet examined by that Committee. Sir Mordaunt Wells' remarks, therefore, apply to my evidence. I am represented to have said, in reply to questions respecting the Bengal educational cess, that I would set aside education altogether rather than see such a cess levied. The fact is that, in answer to questions from the Committee, I said the cultivators in the Bombay Presidency, with whom Government had made revenue settlements for thirty years, regard the imposition of the one-anna cess after such settlements as a breach of faith. I was further asked, What should the Government do to obtain funds for education, &c.? I replied that they should get out of the difficulty in some other way instead of breaking their word, and that even the obnoxious income-tax would be a lesser evil than a measure which involved a breach of faith. This is the sentiment which I expressed before the Committee, and to which I shall always adhere. As to the spread of education, so far from being opposed to it, I consider it to be the best remedy for all the evils that can be conceived.

Dr. MULLINS—I feel very diffident in uttering any opinions on this momentous question, because I have not been able to attend the previous meetings, and can therefore only gather the general tone of the discussion. But, speaking from my own experience, which has extended over many years in India, I venture to say there are two things that are before us in this question. First, How shall we become acquainted with the views of the natives on all great questions which affect their interests; and then follows the question, What form are you willing to allow the opinion to take in the future? We have had both of these questions placed before us to day. Dr. Mouat just now clearly pointed out the mode in which, on certain occasions and crises in his experience, he was enabled to obtain a knowledge of the opinions which were held by the natives; and in respect to the questions of anatomy and vaccination, he showed the great value of the course which was adopted. These illustrations show us that even now there are certain methods by which we can obtain native opinion as to their views of given questions, although there is no doubt that there may be improvements which we should like to see adopted hereafter. I can quite concur with the speakers who have preceded me in thinking that the first thing to be done in order to secure a fair and free opinion of the natives is to maintain a constantly affectionate and friendly intercourse with them, so as to secure their con-

fidence, and induce them to acquaint you with their real views. In many respects the natives have been trained by circumstances, existing through many generations, to be suspicious and distrustful of persons who approach them; but even now you have only to go to the native with an honest, open heart, and he will hardly fail to meet you, and show that he is quite willing to meet you frankly, and to give expression to his views on the subject upon which you address him. I believe that naturally a more amiable people does not exist. In travelling about Bengal, often alone, or accompanied by no one but my own family, and being miles and miles away from any Europeans, I have never experienced the slightest difficulty among the native population, nor have I ever failed to secure help or hospitality from the villages through which I had occasion to pass. I had only to let the people know and see that I was there with no desire but the promotion of their welfare, and, aided with my thorough acquaintance with their own language (an acquisition of inestimable value in intercourse with the natives of India), I was enabled to acquaint myself intimately with their manners and customs and prejudices, so as to avoid injuring their sensitiveness in respect to their habits. By this attitude I was always certain of being received cordially and hospitably; and I firmly believe that we have only to be careful not to overstep the bounds of delicacy in respect to their feelings, and, by acquiring their language, qualify ourselves for a study of their manners, to ensure that our endeavour to evince an interest in their welfare will always be sure of a warm and hearty reception. Now, what are the methods by which we can procure an efficient knowledge of the ideas and prejudices of the natives? For myself I have always considered a perusal of the native newspapers to be highly advantageous. Their editors are generally some of the most prominent and best-educated men in the country, and as such they are exponents of the modern native school of thought. In some of the old Indian editors, such as we used to have thirty years ago, you have a view of the opinions held by the old Pundit class, so we have now a means of learning the views of both the old and modern schools of thought—the latter being one which has grown so strongly as to become of the deepest interest to us, and which must be carefully observed by us, because, I think, we have many important things to learn in the present transition state of things. There are other methods of estimating native opinion which would be highly effective if carried into proper operation, and among the most effectual is the association of native members, not only in the local councils, but also in the interior council of Calcutta. In considering the question of what means we are willing to adopt in establishing the mode by which we can estimate the views of the natives,

there is one point which we ought specially to keep in mind. I think the methods proposed for adoption would all turn upon the end which we have in view. If you adopt Dr. Mouat's opinion you must be prepared to see the natives come forward in the executive and taking a large share in the legislation of the country; you must be prepared to take them and train them into intelligent habits of self-government in municipal institutions and in the management of their own local affairs; and you must be prepared to look forward to the day when we shall see them independent, and in friendly and loving connexion with the mother country which has watched over them for generations. If these are the views of those who initiate a scheme of native councils there will be little difficulty in shaping out the methods by which to obtain public opinion on matters of native interest. As a missionary, that is precisely my position; because, in building a Christian church in India, which shall elevate, enlighten, and train the people to self-government in matters of religion, we look forward to the time when, in due course, we Englishmen—the foreign missionary element which commenced the work—may be able to retire and leave the Church to manage for itself. Are the politicians of India prepared to take a similar step? If they are, and if they say their desire is to lead the natives forward to self-government and friendly connections or federal associations with the British Empire, you will have a clear end in view and a notable task to perform. In establishing the machinery of native councils there are various methods which might be adopted, and although the details cannot be discussed here, they would be of great importance in ensuring a successful issue to the experiments. I should hold this to be true in political as in religious matters, that you cannot legislate or act on the assumption that the whole of the natives of India form one people of 150 millions. They are divided into numerous sections by sects, by caste, by different interests, by physical and social circumstances, and in a variety of other ways; and the result is that you have different stages of development in civilisation and enlightenment, and consequently a widely-varying ability of judgment in respect to public affairs. A mode of procedure would be necessary in the Northern Provinces of India, where the civilisation is generally higher, differing, perhaps, materially from that which could be adopted in the less civilised districts of the South; and among the hill tribes a still lower degree of enlightenment would require a still different treatment. It is evident that you cannot apply the same principles uniformly to a people differing so widely in respect to civilisation and intelligence; you must deal with each district according to its circumstances. You can give the people of Bombay and Calcutta, and perhaps a few other great cities, the power of electing men who will be

fitted to assist in the discussion of the highest problems of government and political science—men who have been trained to consider these questions, and who bring to the task education and intellect. In the towns of Upper India, in Agra, Allahabad, Serampore, Umritsur, Bangalore, and other similar towns of the North, you could apply a principle which could not be extended to the provinces of Southern India; and you could not put the opinion of the latter on a par with the opinions of such cities as Bombay, Calcutta, or towns similarly circumstanced, where there is less of that absence of public spirit which is so mournfully visible throughout India, and which is so deeply regretted by all who desire the welfare of the country. All over the peninsula, but especially in the South, there is a deplorable want of knowledge and public spirit —too little self-denial in giving time to public service for the general benefit of the community. In respect to such a people it must of necessity be that less attention should be paid to their opinions than to those in a more advanced condition; and discrimination must be exercised between the recommendations of public opinion in India, due weight being given to the consideration of the knowledge and experience of the district whence it emanates, and to the position it has been accustomed to take in relation to the great national questions which have come before the country.

Dr. GHOSE.—I wish only to make a few remarks with reference to those institutions which are now in existence in India, and which have for their professed purpose the initiation or admission of natives into the acquirement of self-government—I refer to the municipal councils of the towns; to the principle of giving seats in the Legislative Council to distinguished natives; and to the encouragement of the native newspaper press. These are the three means which have been actually adopted to train the natives of India to acquire the ability to exercise self-government, and they are beyond a doubt very good so far as they go. But, nevertheless, they are each accompanied by serious defects, which greatly mar and hinder their progress. First, in regard to the municipal councils, they are not at all representative in their character or constitution; and assemblies such as these cannot be said in any way to reflect the opinions of the people. It is true that there are native members appointed, but they are nominated, and the nominations are generally made by the local officials. Consequently these men have no really representative capacity in their character; and, together with the native officials and the rich resident European—an indigo planter, probably—with an occasional zemindar, they form a municipal council which in no degree reflects the opinions or desires of the people whom they are supposed to represent. The native officials are generally educated young

men; and the remainder of the assembly, so far as the natives are concerned, is made up by men of considerably less intelligence and education. So that these two classes—the native official and the native nominee—are completely subservient to the European official element, which they cannot and dare not oppose, and which they fear to offend by giving an adverse vote. I speak not without experience on this matter, for I was a member of one of the principal municipal councils. Fortunately in this case the council of which I was a member happened to include a few young men who, although they were officials, had yet the courage to exhibit some public spirit; and there were also two lawyers who were not dependent on the officials for favour. We were consequently enabled to offer some opposition to the European officials, and when any subject was under discussion we were accustomed to pass a paper round for the members to write down their opinions on the matter in hand. In that way we were able to get some valuable independent opinion which otherwise would not have been elicited, owing to the fact that the members—especially the non-official ones, who were persons without education, and chiefly landholders dependent on the favour of the Government officials—did not possess the courage to say anything against the officials of the Board. By the adoption of some such plan as this I am sure you would make the municipal councils much more satisfactory than they are at present, and they would more truly represent the feelings of the people. It was suggested by Sir William Muir that it would be a good education for representation if the municipal councils of the North-west Provinces were formed by election, and, without going to anything like so great an extension as universal suffrage, I think this is what is wanted to interest the people in public affairs. As it is, the people, and especially the poorer classes, who form the mass of the community, while passively yielding to the officials who are imposed upon them by the Government, look upon the Government as an alien one, in whose conduct they have no interest. Nor will their opinions change so long as you permit the majority of the municipal councils to be formed by European officials or persons under their control. In respect to the Indian native press I think it unfortunate that we cannot have a stronger native press. Its present limited influence is due to the preponderance of the Anglo-Indian newspapers, which are edited by gentlemen who usually take a view adverse to the opinions of the natives; but as their newspapers are generally better conducted, and engage the services of the most skilful writers, their circulation is extended, to the depreciation of the native papers, which are less intelligently conducted and which do not thrive under such adverse circumstances. Personally acquainted as I am with more than one editor

of native newspapers, I am satisfied that I have represented their general complaint, which, although perhaps unavoidable, is not less substantial. In respect to the Legislative Council I think the same error exists as is to be found in the municipal councils. Certainly natives are summoned to seats on the Legislative Council, but they are generally men who are far from representing the opinions of the intelligent people; they are generally obsolete old princes or uneducated zemindars. As an instance of what might compose the native element in the Legislative Council I would point to the native gentleman now sitting as judge in the High Court. Would he not be a useful member of the Council of Government? Is he not capable of giving sound opinions respecting civil laws, taxation, and administration? And, if so—and the fact must be admitted by all—why is he not selected? Simply, I believe, because it is thought that he would be a dangerous enemy to the Government. (Expressions of dissent in the meeting.) It may not be the truth that this is the cause, but in stating it I know I express the native opinion of Bengal; and, indeed, the fact shows much cause for dissatisfaction and suspicion. Why should old and effete princes, who have no idea of beneficial legislation, or of political economy, or of enlightened jurisprudence, occupy seats to the exclusion of really intelligent and well-educated men? Why should they continue in a position whose duties they seldom even pretend to fill, except to either give votes of trivial importance or votes which effect more harm than good, and who are persuaded to attend to make a sort of dumb show of legislation? I think it is the duty of the Government and of all Europeans to take every pains to dissipate all suspicion from the minds of the natives, and to that end the officials must be very careful as to the measures they initiate, and as to the mode in which they endeavour to carry them into effect; for upon this latter much depends—officials being too often addicted to carrying matters with a high hand without taking any pains to explain them to the people. The result is the deepening of prejudice and an increased difficulty for the future. It is true that ninety-nine persons out of one hundred are without education; but it must not be forgotten that they are still human beings, and their feelings and prejudices must be consulted if legislation is to be really beneficial to them. Were the native population sufficiently educated to manage their own affairs they would insist upon governing themselves, and it would be impossible to resist the demands of an educated people of 150 millions, and no foreign power could continue to govern them under such conditions. Native intelligence would not be able to bear the presence of a foreign government, so that England, in initiating the beginnings of self-government of India among the native population, should carefully observe the feel-

ings of the people, and judiciously yield to their desires wherever it is in any way practicable. In doing this it is evidently of great importance that in the councils really native opinion should be represented, and that men should be selected for membership whose experience is large, and who express the sentiments of the masses of their countrymen. Such a course is the Government's only safeguard against error and injustice, and the office cannot be performed by Englishmen. Englishmen do not know the real condition of the country, or the real opinions of the people, and, therefore, it is absolutely necessary that they should have some one to advise them on all matters which affect native interest, and to suggest legislation suited to the condition of the country. This would lead to self-government, and to the education of the natives to a sense of responsibility. Of course no one expects, and no one desires, to establish forthwith a system like that which is to be found in England—a system of parliamentary government—but the aim should be to give effectual independence with the principle of federation. This, however, with many other matters, is for the future; the present duty of the Government is to secure native opinion, and to inculcate principles of self-government. And this, I think, may wisely be done on the plan proposed by Sir Bartle Frere.

Mr. Dickinson.—The remarks of the last speaker induce me to offer a few observations which, otherwise, I should not have ventured to make. The question before the meeting is indeed a very large one; and, in considering it, many subsidiary subjects arise which have an important bearing upon it. Public opinion appears to me to be of no value unless it can show itself in some form of action. It is valuable in this country because it makes itself felt through its representatives in Parliament and elsewhere, and it thus becomes effectual; so that by observing its dictates a Government is generally successful. A great many of the observations which have been made respecting the views of the natives in regard to the operations of the Indian Government have ignored this principle. They have been addressed rather to the point of ascertaining the opinion of natives—whether, for instance, this or that form of taxation is more or less disliked—than to giving the natives a voice in the imposition of taxes and the expenditure of the public revenue. It is objected to schemes like that before us now that Western ideas are not adapted to Indian habits and modes of thought. But, on the other hand, we can only carry out successfully those principles of government with which we are familiar, and which we believe to be sound, and we should fail if we attempted any other method than one in which we have been educated, and which we understand; and, consequently, in building up the fabric of government in the East, we had

better adapt to that work principles and institutions with which we are acquainted, and in which we have faith. What we have done in India with a view of eliciting a reliable public opinion which shall bear upon the administration of government has, however, just been declared to be nothing better than a sham; and it is because the previous speaker thus alluded to it that I have risen now. Take, for instance, the municipal government. The principle should be to allow the villages to manage their own affairs, and to extend their knowledge by taking part in the management of a district in the way Sir Bartle Frere suggests, and so to gradually build up a self-governing body, the money for whose purposes might be partly furnished by the Government and partly by the locality, and be administered by the municipality or district, subject to the supervision of the Government. Is that the case now? The remarks of the last speaker have been quite sufficient to indicate that there is no real grant to the people of the right to manage their own affairs, but that the members of the Councils derive their authority from the Government, have an official, and not a representative character, and have no independence of action. This is not the way to obtain the expression of public opinion; it is a sham representation. It is true that of late years there has been introduced into the Legislative Councils what may appear something like a representative principle; but it is simply a nominee system, and I do not believe that the members so nominated have any right of initiative, but are consultative only. Not that I think the time has come, or is near at hand, for India to govern itself, or to send representatives to an Indian Parliament; but the object we should keep steadily in view is to educate the country to that ultimate form of national life. Indian nationality at present does not exist; India is nothing more than a conglomeration of tribes, religious castes, with varying interests, and with ideas often strongly opposed to each other; and it is for us to weld them into a great and united nation. As regards the constitution of the Legislative Council, I sometimes think we might follow with advantage our own historical precedents, and gradually introduce something of a representative system. If, for instance, instead of Government nominating councillors, writs were issued to some of the great towns to send deputies to the Supreme Council, by that means you would be doing something to create a public opinion. But in a scheme like this—and indeed in any great work—it is absolutely necessary that you should have faith in your own principles; and if you have faith in the principle of representative government (which I believe is the only sound principle of government, if properly carried out by degrees and with caution—in small things at first—would be certain of success)—let it be tried honestly and fairly.

But the Western intelligence that administers government in India is, I am afraid, chiefly official and bureaucratic, and has no great faith in representative institutions even in their own country; and, as a consequence the principle has, as yet, been only tried with a want of heart and spirit, which, even if there were no other obstacles, would have endangered its success. The point, therefore, which I desire to impress upon the meeting is, that where we are, as in India, attempting the introduction of an institution which was to have brought upon it the force of opinion external to and beyond that of the governing class, it is of the greatest importance that it should be a reality, and not a sham. Do not place reliance where you have reason to think you will be misled; but if you profess to have faith and confidence, act boldly in accordance with your professions heartily and honestly, and invite confidence by showing it yourselves. As regards the remarks which the speaker who preceded me offered in reference to the character and influence of the Indian native press, I think the native newspapers must be left to take care of themselves. On this point I will only add the obvious reflection, that when a newspaper does not succeed, it is most probably due to one of two causes: the journal either exhibits a want of intelligence in its conduct, or it does not hit the right tone of public feeling; and in either alternative its fate calls for no regret.

General Sir G. Le Grand Jacob.—I regret that my broken health has kept me away from our previous meetings to discuss this subject; for as one who for a period of fifty years has always felt the deepest interest in the welfare of the people of India, and whose public life has been spent amongst them, I was anxious to express the gratitude that I feel we all owe to Sir Bartle Frere for bringing before us a subject so eminently worthy of consideration. Not having heard the discussion, I must limit my remarks to the printed paper issued by the Council. I quite agree with the spirit of Sir Bartle Frere's proposals; and I go heartily with him in conceiving the village community as forming the nucleus of anything like a representative system that may hereafter be formed in India. In fact it is already the representative body of the locality; but I think it is quite premature to attempt to carry out such a scheme now, or to suppose that India is yet ripe for anything resembling the electoral body of our own country. A native gentleman from Bengal who has just spoken has told you that even amongst the educated there is generally no sufficient independence of character to give their real opinions when asked for. If such is the state of native society at the head-quarters of civilisation, it is not to be expected that we can establish anything like a House of Commons for India; and the time for

it is probably far distant. Still we want to press upon the Government the necessity of ascertaining in some more or less efficient way the opinions and feelings of the natives in respect to legislation; and I may be permitted to know something of the importance of this, for I was engaged during two years in investigating the causes of the great rebellion of 1857-58, and I attribute it to the utter disregard of native opinion; to the Government's trampling upon the feelings of the people, so as to excite great exasperation; and this led to the great and terrible explosion. If there had been any attempt to ascertain native opinion upon such acts as interference with the law of adoption the mutiny would never have occurred. Yet the Government appeared to be quite ignorant that if you searched India from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas you would not find a dozen natives—of course I don't mean time-servers—who did not regard the refusal to acknowledge an adopted son as a blow to the whole fabric of Hindoo society. And yet, so ignorant, or so obstinately blind were the Government, as to be guided only by the plausible Englishmen who, among other specious but shallow reasonings, made much of a so-called law of lapse—the very thing the law of adoption was created to prevent. It was the law of ancient civilisations: the Romans permitted it; and, it is in fact based on a most natural feeling; in the eyes of an Indian the right to adopt is as much his as the right to marry. And yet we claimed the right to refuse to sanction it, and, having thus abolished the legal heir, constituted our own nation the heir instead, only, however, when it was deemed profitable so to do; this, I believe, was one of the main causes that led to the entire separation of Hindoo feeling from their governors. There were of course causes, all of which may be traced to the same ignorance or disregard of native opinion—such as abolishing or changing Hindoo laws and usages prematurely. These impolitic measures, combined with some financial grievances, assisted to deepen the native conviction that our Government were bent on the destruction, root and branch, of the Hindoo aristocracy gentry and of their cherished belief. Religious persons, Mahommedan as well as Hindoo, are always traversing the land, thus every facility was afforded to the disinherited and the discontented to spread the contagion of distrust and disaffection, and especially to work upon the feelings of our sepoys, who naturally sympathised with their fellow-countrymen. Thus the feeling of distrust grew general throughout the land. But for this the greased cartridge would at the worst have set on fire a few isolated groups, but it could never have caused the great conflagration of 1857. It is obvious, therefore, how necessary it is to ascertain and consult the native opinion, and this duty should in every possible way be impressed on the Government of the country; for

this reason, it is very satisfactory to find that one of the ruling body—a distinguished public servant—has himself come forward to suggest a plan for ascertaining native opinion, thus showing that he is fully alive to the importance of the subject.

Mr. J. M. Ludlow.—While I should feel disposed to agree most heartily with most of the suggestions made in Sir Bartle Frere's address, there is, it seems to me, one point which, although latent in them, has not been sufficiently brought out—I mean the real strength of public opinion in India. So far from there being *no* public opinion, I should say that if there is one country in the world where this is strong it is in India, for upon it rests the whole fabric of caste observances, maintained as it has been through centuries of foreign domination, and that of a character often actively hostile to it. Again, in respect to the village communities and councils, nothing seems to me more remarkable than the way in which they have subsisted in Bengal—for instance, even when not only ignored by, but unknown, to the Government; and, more extraordinary still, that they should through a long series of generations have maintained an organisation which is now the administration of very able men. Surely in a political mechanism of this kind, maintaining itself quite outside of the law, we have another illustration of the force and persistency of public opinion in India. The question is, therefore, not that of creating a public opinion where none exists, but how to control and modify, and direct to new purposes one of tremendous power, but stationary, and in a great measure directed against us. That the opinion of the natives is an auxiliary which might often be very usefully utilised has been proved by the instances given by Dr. Mouat and other speakers; and I can confirm from a case which is familiar to me the fact that they are willing to accept suggestions and improvements when suitably explained to them by those in whom they have confidence. Every one knows that the Government of India has introduced a system of registration of deeds, and many may also know that on its introduction into the Madras Presidency it was looked upon in many places with great suspicion, as being probably a mere vehicle for a new tax; but in that very presidency, years before it was introduced by officials, my uncle, the late Mr. T. Carnal Brown, of Tellicherry, established a private registry on his own estate, which was resorted to by the natives from a distance of twenty miles of his neighbourhood; and by the payment of a small fee very beneficial results were obtained without the slightest aid from officials, but merely out of the natives' willingness to accept any practical suggestions of advantage to them; and in this way, maintained merely by the force of public opinion, it remained at work till it merged into the Government system. I am convinced that similar results might be

obtained everywhere in India, were Englishmen to take the pains to acquaint themselves with the usages of the natives, and evince an interest in their welfare and progress. As respects the village communities, I am extremely delighted to see them now looked at, not merely in reference to the tenure of land and the incidence of the land-tax, as was the case not so very long ago, but in their social and political bearings the village councils form, as Sir Bartle Frere points out, the ultimate atom of the political state of India. By building upon this foundation as far as may be, and recognising, restoring, recovering it where it has been obliterated by time—and this could be done without much difficulty—you will, and when alone, be able to erect a satisfactory structure of Government, in harmony with the habits and genius of the people. I do not feel qualified to express an opinion on the precise details of Sir Bartle Frere's plan; but as to the interest which may be taken by intelligent natives, other than those whom we have moulded ourselves by education, in the system of political representation under its most highly cultivated form, I may venture to give an instance. Some years ago I was on friendly terms with a native gentleman, the late Rungo Bapojee, who was in this country as vakeel of the Rajah of Sattara. Mr. Hume had procured for him admissions to the Foreign Ministers' Gallery in the House of Commons, and from attending the debates—at first, only when his master's affairs were discussed—he acquired such a taste for our Parliamentary system, that after a time, even when the business upon which his visit originated was not on, he still attended, out of pure delight at witnessing the strifes of statesmen; and he used to say—for it was long, very long, ere he despaired of English justice towards his masters: "When I get back, and the Rajah is restored, we must have a Parliament in Sattara;" giving as a reason that "by this means everything is known, and we must hear both sides." This was only a fair specimen of the better class of his race, a high-caste Mahratta, who kept his caste to the last, drawing his own water from a pump in the street, when all his native servants had left him. His education was not exceptional; he knew no English before coming to this country, learned to write it while here in mature age, and never acquired the capacity of speaking it fluently. But, nevertheless, he showed that he had in him the most perfect appreciation of representative government, and for the exercise of statesmanship on that principle; and, speaking generally, I have little doubt that in the best parts of native society, even where it has been untinged with English views, a similar appreciation of the principle would be developed, if once a field for exercise could be supplied.

Sir Bartle Frere.—I should like to make a few remarks on the

subject of this discussion before it is concluded; and, first of all, I think the Association may be congratulated on the discussion which this question has elicited. I believe it is likely to prove very useful, and I am sure that, in more than one point, it has been a very informing one. There can be no doubt, as was observed by Sir Mordaunt Wells, that the question is in itself a most momentous one, and in its ultimate bearings it has a great deal to do with the question of representation. But that to my mind is a question considerably in the distance; I will not pretend to say how many years it may be, but it is still far off. Suffice it now, however, to say, that it is not the immediate question I had in view, which was one applicable for the present time, even to this present year in which we now live. For it is as necessary that we should know what the people of India think and wish as it is necessary that we should know public opinion in this country. No doubt this necessity must, sooner or latter, lead to the existence of representation. But I should like you to look upon the question as it bears upon the existing machinery of government. Everywhere you find it is confessed that in these days we are not so well able as we were in former times to know what the people wish or think; and although it might be thought that the means of expression have been greatly increased, yet, in fact, our need of them increases at an infinitely greater rate, so that we do not get the voice of the people of India, regarding their own wants and wishes, as quickly or as accurately as is desirable. And this brings me to a point which has been noticed by one of the speakers. He remarked that he was constantly met by the question, "Why can't you let things alone?" And I should like this question to be well pondered over by those who have anything to say in carrying out these views into practical action. Let them consider this absolute fact, that you cannot "let things alone." As long as you are under no necessity for touching the pockets of the people, you may, perhaps, leave such questions to slumber for years; but directly you begin to impose new taxes you raise a multitude of questions which cannot be answered unless you know something of the people—what they think, and how far they are prepared to back their opinions with their money, or with such moral or physical arguments as it may be in their power to use—whether, in fact, what they say is mere outcry and clamour, or whether it involves resistance and resolute opposition. Because, sooner or later, it must come to this when you impose a new tax; and this is a very momentous question, which has presented itself to me for solution more than once during my experience in India —you must know whether such a question of new taxation is one upon which the people will give way, or whether it is one upon which they will resist you to the last These are the questions which really try the govern-

ment and try the people in all countries and ages. Mr. Dickinson has most truly said that upon this point we can have no shams, and it is worse than useless to get an agency which shall deceive us in this matter. If we are not prepared to give effectual, practical weight to the people's desires we had better let the question slumber—if it will slumber—but I do not believe it will. This brings me to another question—whether the people are fit for any such change as I have ventured to indicate. More than one speaker in the course of the discussion has said he conceives we must wait until education has become more generally diffused. Another says you cannot trust the public spirit of the natives of India or their desire to make themselves heard. I do not agree in either of these opinions regarding the natives of India. But these are questions which seem to me to be quite apart from the main question at issue. It seems to me that, whether educated or uneducated, you must take the people as they are, and must learn what they want. If the opinion is an uneducated one so much the worse for you, and so much the more dangerous for you to delay in learning all you can about it. So that, if for no other reason, I should on this ground entirely agree with those gentlemen who have urged that it is above all things necessary in carrying out any measures which we have in view to educate the people. But do not wait until you have educated the people, do not say that they are unlettered, and that, therefore, their opinions are not worth hearing. Hear them at any rate, and if they are educated pay them every attention; but if uneducated still hear them, and have a good care that you do not disregard what their ill-directed and uneducated opinions may drive them to do. Some one has remarked that in order to effect any good result by any measures for ascertaining the opinions of the natives you must separate the natives from the Europeans. I cannot help thinking that this is a most short-sighted view of the question. To some extent discussion must lead to the formulating of opinions which are yet in embryo, and so far our object should be, as far as possible, not to separate the natives from ourselves, and from those who think with the Government, nor to separate the well-informed from the less-informed, but to let the better-informed instruct the less-informed, and in this manner to influence the general opinion. But, whatever you do, by no means separate those educated according to Western opinions from those educated in Eastern principles. I think we need not consider this a mere matter of theory, because I have observed in more than one position that I have occupied—and I am sure Sir Mordaunt Wells and Mr. Fitzwilliam, who have sat with me in Indian Councils, will agree with me—that you are well able to get opinions from the natives when they are associated with Europeans. I feel sure that any one

who really understands the natives, and has really tried to ascertain their opinions, will agree with me that when a native sees that he is allowed to sit side by side with an Englishman he soon acquires a fair amount of English independence of spirit. And allow me to say as an Englishman that though in some respects the natives of India are a more pliable people than the Western races, the apparent pliability is more often due to a natural politeness and very pervading desire to pay attention to the wishes of those with whom they are associated. And thus it often happens that what we are apt to consider as the subserviency of the Indian poor man is what in an English gentleman we should call his courtesy and consideration for the opinions of those with whom he is associated. He does not blurt out and press his opinions upon his hearers with the same force that we are often apt to do among ourselves. In this respect the Indian is open to the same reproach as is sometimes brought against the most refined gentleman among ourselves—namely, that he shrinks more than is perhaps right from saying unpleasant things. But, to turn to another point, it is asked what I propose in respect to this fourfold division of councils, and how should they respectively act? On this part of the question I should like to make one remark with especial reference to the village councils. I need not tell you that, so far are they from being my own invention, that they are probably the oldest part of the social organization of India, and the most universal. At this moment even in Bengal, where they have been ignored for two or three generations, they still exist, and the people meet, and consult and consider, and express opinions to one another; and I feel no doubt they will very soon, if we give them good cause for so doing, be taking action to back their opinions by making petitions and raising subcriptions, and by opposing the action of the Government in some more or less organised form. Therefore, I say, take this network of indigenous institutions and make use of it. But it may be asked, How is this to be done? "Surely," it has been said, "you would not convert all those who sit in such councils into electors for an Indian Parliament?" Such a course as this, I need hardly assure you, never entered into my idea of what was possible, especially if it were attempted in some of the ways which have been devised by English Legislatures during the last generation or two. But what I would urge is, that you should look first at what the village councils can do for their own villages, and we know perfectly well that as far as the adminstration of their own village affairs goes you want nothing better, as any one who has been a good district officer will at once admit. If he wanted anything done in the village, a good district officer will tell you that he had only to find out the village's ordinary

advisers, and they could do the business quite perfectly so far as they were concerned. I would then have all these parochial duties recognised as an official part of the system of government; and to this I would add the power to select those who should sit in what we should in England call the county boards, which would help to administer the affairs of the district, consisting of from ten or twenty to, it may be, two hundred villages. The men who would sit on these county boards would not, of course, be men who have been educated up to the university standard; they would generally be not much better than village notaries, or active and intelligent farmers. But they would do the work required of them —the parish and county work; and, furthermore, when you have done with them for these purposes, they will form a very good body from which to select members for the provincial councils. And I have no doubt that in almost all cases the persons elected to such provincial councils would be either men of education who have been trained in the schools provided by the Government for the natives, or, if not, if they were not well-educated men, they would be men of that keen, active, intelligent, practical good sense and natural talent which is above all price, and which is just the thing you want to secure. In these provincial councils you would have in all probability some such men who would be able to write their names with difficulty, but you will get from them pithy common-sense opinions worth more than mere book learning. These provincial councils would have large and important duties, such as the care of roads, hospitals, schools, &c., and I am glad to have the testimony of so experienced and so able a witness as Dr. Mouat in favour of the inestimable value of native assistance in such matters. The provincial work would not only be done all the better for such aid, but from these provincial councils there might be elected in the local legislative councils ten or a dozen men, whose opinions would really be worth much in making laws and regulations. A fear has been expressed by one speaker that we might go too fast and be prematurely swamped, and that the Government nominees would be over-weighted by a number of rather radical native representative members. But I think there will always be in India the same sort of deference that we find in Germany and France, and which existed in England up to within the memory of our fathers— I mean that the mere knowledge that the Government wished a particular thing would in itself be a power of immense influence. And, therefore, I do not think you need be in the least afraid of having in each of the Legislative Councils of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Lahore, and Agra, ten or a dozen men who have been freely elected by the provincial councils, or that you need apprehend their proving disloyal to the

English Government—as far as I know—although of course there are exceptions here and there, and you may meet now and then in India what we might call a dangerous Communist; yet, as a general rule, I believe that the more a native is educated the less inclined he is to favour any radical change in the state of things. And you may depend upon it the more they are trusted the more sensible will they be what a great blessing to India is the power which now governs the country. There is, I firmly believe, no more sincere appreciation of English laws, English morality, English literature, English habits of thought, and all that we value as the real backbone of our system of government in this country, than is to be found among the best-educated natives in India. And, therefore, I agree entirely with Mr. Dickinson as to the disadvantages of the present system of exclusive nomination, and I should be extremely glad to see it supplemented by some such plan as that which I have endeavoured to sketch—that is, by the selection of men freely chosen by the provincial councils to represent their opinions. Yet I must say that I never found among my native colleagues at Bombay or Calcutta any want of readiness to give information, or backwardness in giving vent to independent opinions on topics that came before the council. The great measure which Lord Canning always advocated, and which he inaugurated by inviting natives to assist in the Councils of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, was confessedly experimental. I can give my testimony to its complete success so far, that the members have always delivered their opinions in a manner to command the respect of those with whom they were associated, and to encourage the English Government to proceed further in the same direction. Something has been said in reference to the views of the Duke of Wellington respecting native opinion on government, which may, I think, lead to misapprehension. He said that he had never met with a people who were such complete philosophers about all questions relating to their government. In saying this I have no doubt he referred to their indifference to the form of the Imperial Government. He well knew the perfect system of municipal organisation in villages and districts, which made it practically a matter of moonshine to the Indian peasant who ruled at the capital of the country—whether a Mohammedan, a Hindoo, or an English government. He had seen that the natives would go on in their village communities pretty much the same as they had always done, in accordance with their ancient institutions. And it is this which made the native indifferent as to who nominally ruled the country, or by what name the imperial power was called which held him subject. We must recollect, too, that the Duke of Wellington had at his side Malcolm, Elphinstone, Munro, and many more of the

same stamp, and in hearing their opinions he was sure to have the opinion of men who, in their own spheres, were accustomed to study and to watch native opinion in a far more effective manner than we can do now. To sum up, what I recommend is that you should leave as much as possible parochial duties to the parish, county work to the counties, and provincial work to the provinces; and that in each grade—in India as in England—in the parish, in the county, and in the province, you should have an organisation capable of advising the local officers of Government in a systematic, recognised, and authoritative manner. I believe that, under such a system, far more will be effected than under any over-centralised imperial system like that of France. I have no doubt you will find that the general lines of any national policy which the people and Parliament of England may desire to carry out in India will be precisely those which the native educated opinion will support. If you will only summon the most intelligent natives in India to your councils, I believe you need not fear that a well-considered policy, according to our English opinions, will ever be unacceptable to them. I fear I have detained you longer than I had any right to do, but the importance of the subject must plead my excuse, although the want of time obliges me also to omit many things to which I would have gladly referred.

The CHAIRMAN.—Before we separate I feel that we can hardly do so without expressing once more our very great obligation to Sir Bartle Frere for the most instructive and important paper which, perhaps, has been laid before the East India Association. I am sure it must be most gratifying to Sir Bartle Frere, not less than to the other gentlemen who have attended these meetings, to find the subject received with so much attention, and that it should have been followed up by such an interesting discussion—a discussion which, I think, reflected the highest credit upon the Association for the admirably temperate tone by which it has been characterised, especially on the part of the native gentlemen who have been pleased to address us. I cannot but think that when the report of the discussion is published in India, it will excite the liveliest interest, and that it may be followed by some good practical results. I hope, amongst other things, it will lead to the East India Association becoming more and more the focus to which the native gentlemen who visit this country from time to time may be drawn. Every year increases the number of these visitors to England; they come from all parts of India, and represent the better-educated class of our native fellow-subjects, and if they can be induced to take part in the work of the East India Association, they will benefit us by giving us the reflection of the opinions of their fellow-countrymen, and this Association may congratulate itself upon having, in some measure, contributed to a realisa-

tion of Sir Bartle Frere's scheme. I will now call upon you to vote your cordial thanks to Sir Bartle Frere.

Sir MORDAUNT WELLS, in seconding the motion, observed that it was exceedingly gratifying to find that this great question had been brought before English public opinion by a member of the Indian Council, who had served the highest offices in India, as member of the Legislative Council, of the Supreme Council, and as Governor of Bombay. That such a man should bring his great knowledge and experience to such a task was, in the highest degree, gratifying. "I agree, also," added the speaker, "with the gallant Chairman in commending the tone of this discussion, for it shows that we have but one feeling in discussing a topic like this, and that is, that we fully appreciate that we are dealing with a subject affecting the happiness and welfare of an immense population which has been for a time placed under our care."

Mr. FITZWILLIAM observed that it would be but justice to acknowledge the deep obligations which were due to the Chairman for his presidency during the three sittings over which the discussion had extended, and for the care he had exhibited in carrying out the views of the East India Association.

Mr. DICKINSON seconded the motion by observing that he was sure the meeting were anxious to express their thanks to Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Vincent Eyre.

The two votes were then agreed to *nem. con.*, and the Chairman, in acknowledging the compliment, expressed the gratification he felt at doing whatever was in his power to further the interests of the East India Association, and to advance the moral and social condition of the people of India.

A vote of thanks was also passed to the Society of Arts for allowing the Association the use of their room.

Printed by W. J. JOHNSON, 121, Fleet-street, London, E.C.

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book clean and moving.

S. B., 148. N. DELHI.